MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW

1982

Military Chaplains' Review

"Ethics"
I

DA Pam 165-133
Spring, 1982

Military Chaplains' Review

"Ethics"
I

DA Pam 165-133
Spring, 1982

Preface

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to those articles having lasting value as reference material.

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is published quarterly. The opinions reflected in each article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Chief of Chaplains or the Department of the Army. When used in this publication, the terms "he," "him," and "his" are intended to include both the masculine and feminine genders; any exceptions to this will be so noted.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, double spaced, to the Editor, *Military Chaplains' Review*, United States Army Chaplain Board, Myer Hall, Bldg. 1207, Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703. Articles should be approximately 8 to 18 pages in length and, when appropriate, should be carefully footnoted. Detailed editorial guidelines are available from the editor on request.

Chief of Chaplains

Chaplain (MG) Kermit D. Johnson

Editor

Chaplain (MAJ) Richard N. Donovan

Editorial Assistant

SFC Daniel L. Terpening

Editors Emeritus

Chaplain (LTC) Rodger R. Venzke, October 1976—July 1981
Chaplain (LTC) Joseph E. Galle III, July 1974—September 1976
Chaplain (LTC) John J. Hoogland, May 1971—June 1974

The *Military Chaplains' Review* (USPS 590-430) is published and distributed quarterly as a sequential Department of the Army Pamphlet under the provisions established by the Office of the Adjutant General, Department of the Army—Address all inquiries to Editor, *Military Chaplains' Review*, U.S. Army Chaplain Board, Myer Hall, Bldg. 1207, Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703 telephone [201] 532-2401; autovon 992-2401—Mailed quarterly second class from Springfield, VA.

A New Stage: Beyond "In-House" Ethical Issues

The Army Chaplaincy's contribution to ethics in the Army is moving into a new stage. Previously our efforts were geared to legitimization of the subject and consciousness-raising around ethical issues. This, of course, involved a clarifying process as to the Army chaplain's role and interest in ethics.

The proponency for ethics in the Army at Department of the Army level has been with the Directorate of Human Resources Development of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.

TRADOC has established the Combined Arms Center as proponent for leadership and ethics. The Combined Arms Center is to write leadership and ethical doctrine based on input from the Soldier Support Center, The Organizational Effectiveness Center and School, and others.

This means that the U.S. Army Chaplaincy role in the area of ethics has been and remains that of providing resources and inputs. Many chaplains have taken an interest in the field by serving as consultants, writing articles, delivering speeches, holding workshops, sponsoring discussions at the unit level, etc. A number of chaplains teach ethics in service schools. Two chaplains have been specially trained at Harvard and at Rice in the field of ethics for assignment to the faculty at the U.S. Army Chaplain School and at the Soldier Support Center, Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Indiana. Thus, at all levels of the Army chaplains have been active in promoting ethical values and an ethical climate.

The new stage involves surfacing issues beyond "in-house" ethical issues, important as they are. In the January newsletter, I described a new effort which will focus on the views of religious ethicists, leaders, and groups as they address the ethical implications of nuclear warfare. Provided we do our homework well, this research can be of utmost importance not only to us, but to the leaders of our Army and nation. It should be an important contribution to understanding and dialogue.

The *Military Chaplains' Review* will focus on ethics in this and the Summer 1982 issues. I commend them to your reading with pride because they demonstrate well that we are indeed "leaven" and "salt" in the military environment. Please share them liberally with line officers and non-commissioned officers as well.

—Chaplain (MG) Kermit D. Johnson

Headquarters
Department of the Army
Washington, DC

Spring 1982

Military Chaplains' Review

Articles **Page**

A New Stage: Beyond "In-House" Ethical Issues
Chaplain (MG) Kermit D. Johnson v

The "Melting" Experience: Grow or Die
Loyalty to the Group
Vice Admiral James Bond Stockdale (ret.) 1

Where Have All the Leaders Gone?
Chaplain (CPT) Ross B. Jackson 11

Select Questions in Bio-Medical Ethics
Chaplain (MAJ) John A. Rasmussen 23

Values and the Professional Soldier
Major James L. Narel 33

By the Book:
The Military Ethics of General William T. Sherman
Chaplain (MAJ) John W. Brinsfield 41

Educational Strategies for Moral Development
Chaplain (LTC) Donald W. Gover 59

Periodical Reviews 71

Book Reviews 87

Index 101

The 'Melting' Experience: Grow or Die

Loyalty to the Group

James Bond Stockdale, *Vice Admiral, Retired*

Your President* and I have a mutual friend, a Boston thoracic surgeon who has a great sensitivity for issues concerning the meaning of life and the nature of man. It's easy to understand how a man who spends the best part of his busy days at the pressure packed juncture of life and death could become absorbed in philosophical thought. But this medical doctor doesn't let it go at that. He refines his thoughts through reading, and shares the best of his findings of high quality professional articles, those bearing on the human predicament in general and human ethics in particular, with Father O'Malley, and me, and a few others. Well all this bears on how I'm going to spend the next 15 minutes, because it follows that any of us in the Doctor Eugene Laforet network could expect our colleagues to have some pretty strong notions about ethical systems and their formulation. And sure enough, Father O'Malley—shall we say "strongly suggested"—that I expose some of mine today.

Pressurized experiences have a way of giving us an overload of dilemmas that can't wait for a waffled solution. One seems to be continually in the position described by Dr. Alfred North Whitehead, of not being able to bring half an umbrella to work just because the weather man says there's a 50 percent chance of rain. When Dr. Eugene Laforet gets a person's chest opened up, he has to cut here or cut there in a finite interval of time. He can't waffle it. Students at John Carroll University have to take the scheduled exam and pass or flunk, ready or not. Life seems to become compressed, running ahead, as if being watched on a movie screen—with the projector set on "high speed rewind."

But in these circumstances, as your attention is channelled, as you concentrate, you can sometimes sense that you're undergoing a "melting"

Vice Admiral James Bond Stockdale served for more than thirty years as an officer of the regular Navy, most of those years at sea as a fighter pilot aboard aircraft carriers. Shot down on his second combat tour over North Vietnam, he was the senior naval service prisoner of war in Hanoi for eight years—tortured fifteen times, in leg irons for two years, and in solitary confinement for four. He left the naval service as its most highly decorated member, wearing twenty-six personal combat decorations including the Congressional Medal of Honor. He served two years as president of the Naval War College prior to retirement. As a civilian he has been a college professor, a college president, and is now a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution.

*This speech was delivered at the John Carroll University Commencement, Cleveland, Ohio, May 24, 1981. Reprinted with permission of *Vital Speeches* and the author.

experience. Some of your inhibitions and pre-set feelings, fears and biases "melt" as you come to realize that under the gun, you must grow or fail—in some cases, grow or die. A sort of transformation takes place under pressure... under what the alchemists of the middle ages called the "hermetic".

The "hermetic" idea is old, and had come down from ancient Greece and Egypt and was colored by Christian sacramental teaching. It was a twofold concept. It meant something sealed off—hermetically sealed, as we say. And it also meant magic—particularly magical transformation. You put something in a crucible or a retort and you subjected it to certain pressures like heat, or doses of sulphur or mercury. If you were lucky or wise or both, some kind of creative transformation would take place. In physical terms, this referred to the changing of base metals into precious ones—lead into gold. But the top grade alchemical philosophers were not content with mere physical crucibles and crystal retorts you could hold in your hand. They were aiming at even more important things. Paracelsus thought it might be possible to create a human being (homunculus) in the laboratory — something today people are again getting uneasy about. The higher alchemy aimed not at mere physical change but at moral and spiritual transformation. The crucible and retort became symbols of creative growth. Fire and the twin elements, sulfur and mercury, came to represent the outside pressures exerted upon the human soul in its confined place. In extreme cases, the fire might be of hellish origin. But if the soul in question were strong enough, not mere passive matter, that spirit might undergo an alchemical change — a metamorphosis of the spirit in which the ordinary stuff of humanity could turn into something precious, emerging as if from a tightly sealed cocoon.

This alchemy comparison may sound far fetched, but it contains a hint of the sort of process of intellectual and even spiritual transformation I'm going to talk about today. A person's ethical notions tend to crystalize in the "hermetic." Mine did. The pressure chamber in which my most deeply felt ideas were forged was not a surgical operating room, not a pressure packed classroom, but a prison cell.

Prisons have been crucibles of both degradation and creative impulse throughout history. Like most pressure chambers, they seem to draw out the very best and the very worst in mankind. Writers have attributed prison inspiration to Boethius, Cervantes, Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn, and dozens of other ex-convicts who later made their mark in the world. But in many cases, the main inspiration was obtained through reflection, through the opportunity their prison experience provided them for uninterrupted thought, time for them to reorder their lives while languishing.

I have had periods of more or less stress free imprisonment, even in solitary confinement. A fellow prisoner, a math scholar, once did me the tremendous favor of passing to me (and I mean by that putting it through the concrete wall between us with our tap code, as I memorized it) an

arithmetic formula of expansion that in a remarkably few iterations of such simple form that they could be performed with a stick in the dust, would yield natural logarithms to three or four decimal places. After weeks of thought, I reconstructed the process of going from natural logarithms to logs of the base ten. I slowly became the world's greatest expert on the exponential curve; I dusted off the construction of a log log duplex deci-trig slide rule in my head (no pencils or papers allowed in the cell—my log tables had to be etched with a nail on the concealed side of a bed board). I became one of the few men alive to truly understand why any number raised to the zero power necessarily had to be unity, why zero factorially is unity, and so on. I spent months and months in deep concentration and, at one point, could have written a pretty good advanced mathematics text. I knew the logarithmic—exponential picture inside out.

You might find it interesting that after I'd been home about two weeks I was so struck with disillusionment at the contents of a freshly received letter that I almost cried. It was just a short letter from my young son's prep school math teacher with a casual request for a brief-written summary of all it took to build a slide rule in prison, He obviously had devoted very little reflection to the comprehensiveness of mathematical development entailed. I chose not to do it, and I hope you can understand my frustrating dismay with the commonplace insensitivity of this big easy "world of yackety yack," as I sometimes maliciously thought of it those first weeks out. More about disillusionment later.

Those stress-free prison experiences occurred only late in the game—only after the North Vietnamese ceased trying to extort propaganda and other material from us (a heaven sent reprieve which took effect only after President Nixon came into office and reversed the previous administration's misguided policy of keeping known instances of communist brutality against American prisoners secret from the American press). My mathematical thoughts came from the stress-free period; the ethical thoughts came from the period when the pressure was on—extortive pressure, torture pressure—pressure to the limit to get us to contribute to what turned out to be their winning propaganda campaign beamed at the American man-on-the-street—pressure to the limit to get us to inform on one another. These last two ideas were tied together as integral parts of the extortion system.

I'm not here to tell war stories today, but I must give you just a little more descriptive information if I'm to get across what I mean by the melting experience. The central strategy of the extortion system involved not only the imposition of loneliness, but of fear and guilt—fear of pain and guilt at having betrayed your fellow. We were all in solitary confinement, and solemnly warned that any attempt to communicate with fellow Americans, by wall tap, by signal, by whisper, you name it, would be evidence of our ingratitude for the humane and lenient treatment of Ho Chi Minh. The rules of the game were that such "ingratitude" gave the North Vietnamese the moral justification for pommeling the communicator—

while his arms were simultaneously squeezed with tourniquets, shutting off the blood circulation until he "submitted." Their system was designed to produce the propaganda and information they wanted whether the American chose either of the two obvious ways to go: to stay off the prisoner communication tap code network, and eventually become so depressed after a couple of years that he would presumably be willing to "buy" human contact at the price of collaboration with the enemy—or to join the American communication network, that is to say to join the American covert civilization, get caught communicating as one eventually did from time to time, and then he put through the standard chain of events. That chain went from torture to submission to confession to apology to atonement. The atonement was of course to be the giving away of prisoner secrets—being an informer in other words—plus the writing of the old propaganda statement about how you had been guilty of bombing "churches, schools, and pagodas," In theory at least, we were in a no win situation.

I think that's enough background to show that we were in a pressurized quagmire of ethical dilemmas. People were trying to use us and have us tear each other up in the process. From this cauldron were extruded some basic ethical guideposts.

Now Father O'Malley asked that I talk about ethical notions of the sort that would qualify as growing within a person's interior self, and not simply a set of "lessons learned" from without. Be assured that I'm not just building up a set of guideposts for prison, or for a more general military setting. My conclusions are infinitely general. From this eight year experience I distilled one all purpose idea, plus a few corollaries. It is a simple idea, an idea as old as the scriptures, an idea that is the epitome of high mindedness, an idea that naturally and spontaneously comes to men under pressure. If the pressure is intense enough or of long enough duration this idea spreads without the need even for its enunciation. It just takes root naturally. It is an idea that in this big easy world of yackety yack seems to violate the rules of game theory if not of reason. It violates the ideas of Adam Smith's invisible hand, our ideas of human nature, and probably the second law of thermodynamics. That idea is: "You Are Your Brother's Keeper."

That's the flip side of "What's in it for me?". If you recognize the first as an expression of virtue, and the second as an expression of vice, as I'm sure any student of Father O'Malley would recognize them, let Bacon's distinction add relevance to my concentration on adversity on this graduation day of joy: "Adversity doth best induce virtue... While luxury doth best induce vice."

I need to tell you that it soon became clear that the only way to go—for peace of mind, for mental health if you will—as well as for practicality, was to forget that business about lying low and staying out of trouble by not communicating. Everybody had to get on the line and expect frequent torture after being caught — because we had a civilization

to build, a civilization of Americans behind walls, a civilization of political autonomy that would rule itself with its own laws with almost no contact with the parent country or its government in Washington for eight years. (Thank God.)

When I started teaching philosophy at the Naval War College about four years ago, I commenced reading the philosophical literature of the Vietnam era and came across a startling essay about prisoner of war ethics by Harvard Professor Michael Walzer. One of the major flaws of this piece, written about 1970, three years before I was released, was the recurring theme of individual rights and how the individual prisoner had no obligation to bother with cooperating with fellow prisoners in a clandestine organization because the poor incarcerated soul had enough to do in following the orders of the captors. He couldn't have been more wrong. To ignore your fellow man in the pressure chamber is to betray him. Anybody who has been there knows that your neighbor in the cell block becomes the most precious thing on earth. I'll try to explain some of the reasons why.

When you're alone and afraid, and you feel your culture is slipping away from you, and even though you're hanging on to your memories—memories of language, of poetry, of prayers, of mathematics—hanging on with your fingernails as best you can—and yet in spite of all your efforts you still see the bottom of the barrel coming up to meet you and you realize how thin and fragile our veneer of culture is, when you suddenly realize the truth that we all can become animals when cast adrift and tormented for a mere matter of months or seasons, you start having some very warm thoughts about the only life preserver within reach—that human mind, that human heart next door. You become unashamed to say what you mean when your pal is being taken out for torture for being caught trying to get a message to you. You tap "God Bless You, Jerry", or perhaps "I Love You, Jerry."

Man's need for his fellows was certainly spotlighted in those exaggerated circumstances. We were able to defy what is often billed as the natural selfishness of man, even the survival instinct of man, by sticking to the spirit of ideas like "Unity Over Self," and other axioms of our organization. The sting of guilt was taken out of the program by the common sense expedient of never keeping secrets from other Americans. No matter what we said or were forced to say under torture in the privacy of the interrogation room, we routinely put out the details on our tap code net. This was a natural for tactical defense and expediency, but it was a hidden pearl for the expiation of guilt feelings. We learned that the virtues of truthfulness and straightforwardness have their own reward.

But there was more to this being your brother's keeper than being rewarded in a practical sense. J. Glenn Gray, a professor of philosophy at Colorado College until his death in 1977 wrote of that special power of comradeship to overcome man's alleged basic instinct of self preservation. He made his observations as a footsoldier on the European battlefields of

WWII and recorded them in one of his books, *The Warriors*. I was at a convocation at Colorado College (where three of my sons have gone) when their President introduced me to this man and his literature by remarking that Professor Gray was the only serious scholar of recent times to reflect deeply on how men behave in mutually shared danger, mutually shared pressure. His book, and my conversations with him the year before he died corroborated what I saw in Hanoi. Glenn Gray wrote: *

> Numberless soldiers have died, more or less willingly, not for country or honor or religious faith or for any other abstract good, but because they realized that by fleeing their posts and rescuing themselves, they would expose their companions to greater danger. Such loyalty to the group is the essence of fighting morale, The commander who can preserve and strengthen it knows that all other physical and psychological factors are little in comparison. The feeling of loyalty, it is clear, is the result and not the cause of comradeship. Comrades are loyal to each other spontaneously and without any need for reasons. Men may learn to be loyal out of fear or rational conviction, loyal even to those they dislike.

(Glenn Gray contrasts comradeship with friendship)

> Friendship is not just a more intense form of comradeship. It is its very opposite. While comradeship wants to break down the walls of self, friendship seeks to expand these walls and keep them intact. The one relationship is ecstatic, the other wholly individual. Nothing is clearer than that men can act contrary to the alleged basic instinct of self preservation and against all motives of self interest and egoism. Were it not so, the history of our civilization would be completely different than what it has been.

The question is sometimes asked of those who have been for long periods in high stress situations, "What kept you going?" "What was your highest value?" My answer is: The Man Next Door.

What about corollaries to this single, simple, old fashioned idea?

First, let's talk about very recent history. How does what I've said track with the way we Americans handled the matter of the hostages in Iran? Did we credit them with that nobility of spirit, that pride of autonomy and self reliance that generates within a body of people of good will, united in a common cause under pressure?

I don't think we gave them a chance to generate that spirit. We played with them like rag dolls. We couldn't keep our hands off them, allowing do-gooders to parade them before TV cameras, arranging for and executing piecemeal destabilizing early releases (President Carter worked for a release through Yasir Arafat of the PLO the parole of United States Marines in the first weeks of the affair—Marines whose duty it was to remain with their legation in accordance with the Code of Conduct), in general fostering the idea that the captive legation staff was not a proud autonomous band, but a bunch of pitiable lost sheep —children stranded at the bus station waiting for a parent to come down and take them home.

---

*J. Glenn Gray, *The Warriors: Reflections on Men in Battle*, Harper and Row, 1973

Americans don't seem to be able to grasp the politics and psychology of terrorism and hostage taking. Here's a chance for this class of 1981 to get in on the ground floor. After the Pope was shot the papers were full of thoughtful reflections and predictions by informed people. Their message, class of '81, was that your age will be the age of terrorism and hostage taking.

A better explanation of my thoughts on this recent hostage issue was in the Sunday Washington Post on January 25th, the day the main body of the hostages arrived back in the United States. I entitled my article "Extortionist Theatre." I see this whole scene as a modern art form, a vile art, but like most arts, fed and supported by their audience. Of course actors are needed, too. In the recent show, America furnished both the actors and the audience. The hostages were on camera, our squeamish President was publicly agonizing and assuring the world and the Iranians that no damage would be inflicted on the theatre, and the American man on the street demanded and got his daily dose of several hours of hostage soap opera. To any outlaw group or government with that natural bent for extortion this whole scene spelled one thing: Gold Mine!!!"Just swoop in and grab a dozen Americans, get the show in the news, get the hands wringing and the tears flowing and you can write your own ticket." Some countries know how to stop this. If you're interested, check with Israel.

A second corollary could also become a public policy issue. How does what I've said track with the well intentioned suggestion I sometimes hear, the one that goes something like this: "You military prisoners went through hell—trying to protect information that wasn't worth it—and by refusing to make statements against your government which were no worse than those Senator Fulbright was making. Let's get smart. Forget the Code of Conduct. Tell the world we've instructed our prisoners to say or write anything they're asked to say or write. That way we would defuse the whole situation."

Let me tell you that the enemy extortionists would really like that system. With resistance brushed aside, they would just dig deeper and play even more lethal games with guilt. Don't kid yourself into thinking they're going to start with an anti-war statement in a candy store like that. More likely subjects for their first assigned prisoner essays would be matters like: "Why I know that capitalism made my mother a whore," or "Why I believe it is every prisoner's duty to inform on his fellow Americans." In a prison civilization, even a covert one, a person's most-prized possession is his reputation with his peers. Right off the bat, dissension would dominate the scene because a lot, if not most people will just not stoop to self imposed degradation. They will refuse to write anything. Who's going to order them to follow this proposed new U.S. Government policy? Are you going to ask the senior prisoner to do that? You would never get me to do that. You can't get out of this predicament by making it optional, either. This oft heard proposal has an inherent logic that drives toward destructive guilt feelings and disunity. Togetherness would go, self respect would go, and

the prison civilization would become an animal farm. It has been said that you can't legislate morality. You can't legislate degradation either. My message on this corollary is: "You can't make a good man under pressure finesse evil, no matter how smart it seems."

A third corollary also focuses on conventional "smartness." How does what I've said track with this fact which I generally believe to be the truth: Well applied torture can eventually make any man give up particular facts that the interrogating ghoul knows he knows. When confronted with this, the "smart money" guys from the big easy world of yackety yack might say: "When you know your enemy is on a winning wicket, why resist?" "It defies common sense to resist—save your strength for something important." "Don't fight City Hall."

My point is that people of good will under pressure united in a common cause do fight City Hall. Thank God. When the cool rational "smart money" skeptics challenge the united sacrifice in this example, several answers are possible:

A practical answer:

> It's the only way to go in an extortion environment—everybody make 'em hurt him. The ghouls don't like to have to hurt everybody. They don't like to be reminded of our unity. Furthermore, when you see how frustrated it makes 'em, it makes you like to live with yourself.

An Aristotelian answer:

> Man is not a package of on-off switches; he is not at his base some sort of binary computer. Compulsion and free will can coexist. To give up just because you know you can't achieve total success is a form of determinism. I don't subscribe to environmental, genetic, or any simplistic determinism. Will is the thing, Man makes his character here on earth. I am the master of my fate, the captain of my soul.

My answer: Loyalty to the group. I have a reputation to uphold with them. I can't let them down. They are my country. They are my family. I'm not a kid stranded in the bus station trying to minimize the pain while I wait for my mother country to come and pick me up.

Finally, one corollary that falls out of that ecstatic relationship that comes as a surprise to most of us. I'm picking up on that suggestion that I would have more to say about disillusionment. I'm going to talk about how easy it is for a well intentioned person to commit a cruelty of disillusionment under pressure.

It's important here to interject the fact that we in those prisons were not an unsophisticated group. We were almost all fighter pilots, all had bachelor's degrees and more than half of us had at least one advanced degree. At least most were sophisticated enough to know that as intelligent people we should be able to cope with tentativeness and commitment at the same time—much as Aristotle would have us cope the ideas of free will and compulsion at the same time. What I'm saying is that by and large we were able to accommodate commitment unto death and freedom of thought at the same time. Political or religious orthodoxy were not requirements for

joining the club. But I think we all tacitly agreed that insensitivity and lack of restraint in the expression of destabilizing personal views to others was very poor form.

Nevertheless, I saw cruelty of disillusionment kill a depressed and thoughtful man. You would never guess how. It was not messages of gloom, but cheery messages of hope, persistently drummed into him month after month that eventually did him in. He internalized and took seriously those "sure fire" upcoming release dates. After a number had uneventfully passed us by, his mind drifted away, he got so he couldn't hold his rice down, and he died of a broken heart.

After I returned, I later found that there are many examples of that in the literature. Some of you may have read the book *Man's Search for Meaning* by Viktor Frankl, veteran of the holocaust, and a psychologist and lecturer. He says that the big threats to morale in the crucible are not the pessimists, but the incurable vocal and persistent optimists. That being so, think how much damage, more damage, gratuitous statements of political or religious dissent could do to people close to the wire. It is easy to forget that in this age of free speech at any cost.

That was not forgotten in Hanoi, probably because we were all so close to one wire or another, and so determined—spontaneously determined, ecstatically determined, to prevail, to see each other through, with love, together.

> We asked for strength that we might achieve; God made us weak that we might obey. We asked for health that we might do great things; He gave us infirmity that we might do better things. We asked for riches that we might be happy; We were given poverty that we might be wise. We asked for power that we might have the praise of men; We were given weakness that we might feel the need of God. We asked for all things that we might enjoy life; We were given life that we might enjoy all things. We received nothing that we asked for — all that we hoped for—And our prayers were answered. We were most blessed.
>
> (anonymous prayer)

John Carroll University, Class of 1981, may you all be blessed.

Where Have All the Leaders Gone?

Chaplain (CPT) Ross B. Jackson

Introductory Statement

An even cursory reading of contemporary "in-house" Army literature reveals a growing interest in, and discussion of, two interrelated topics: leadership and ethics. The intent of this article is three-fold: To show how leadership and management practices have become confused, to the detriment of leadership; to show clearly three key questions which must be raised by a leader at any level, if his/her leadership is to be effective; finally, to ask the question of ethical context as this relates to both the planning and the performance of the leaders at every level in today's Army.

Leadership and Management: Confusion

The confusion of leadership and management in the Army, in both methodology and practice, is an extraordinarily complex issue. The interweaving between American business practices of management and their potential application to Army leadership practices can be traced back at least as far as World War II. The (then) Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall turned to the modern business corporation as a proven model, available to him, for the handling of the complex logistical, tactical, and personnel requirements of that war.[1] The utility of these organizational and management concepts and practices for handling the daily requirements of the Army institution became so accepted, well used, and ingrained into the system that, by the time Robert F. McNamara became Secretary of Defense "the individual military officer had become identified with the corporate executive, to the point where the functions of command were perceived as identical to the functions of departmental management...

[1]Richard A. Gabriel and Paul L. Savage, *Crisis in Command*, Hill & Wang, (New York, 1978), pp. 17-25.

Chaplain (CPT) Ross B. Jackson holds a B.A. Degree from Colgate University and an M. Div.Dgree from Yale Divinity School. After completing the Chaplain Officer Basic Course in the Summer of 1976, Chaplain Jackson was assigned to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. Two years later, Chaplain Jackson was assigned to Germany as a Chaplain in a Nike-Hercules Air Defense Artillery Battalion. After three years in that assignment, he was assigned to the Chaplain Officer Advanced Course at Fort Monmouth, NJ. He is currently serving as chaplain to the 894th Engineer Battalion (Combat Heavy), Fort Lewis, Washington.

military leadership, in the traditional sense, had become obsolete."[2] What had happened over these years was that the Army looked less and less like its traditional self, and looked more and more like a carbon copy of the modern corporation. Now largely listed "among the missing" were the following characteristics of the Army: an establishment which possessed a positive sense of uniqueness/apartness from the larger society; a sense of ethics, rooted in its own positive experience, based primarily upon both individual and collective integrity; and a series of traditions that once had defined the "way of the soldier," which inculcated,a strong sense of belonging, and fostered commitment, competence, and loyalty.[3] Overall, what was missing was that sense of purpose, of belonging, of common value commitment, which had, historically, formed the basis for the exercise of leadership in the Army, and which both required and enabled people to work together in the pursuit of common goals. In this situation, the Army went into the Vietnam War. Gabriel and Savage argue, I think persuasively, that the disintegration of the Army during that war must be seen in large part to be due to the "massive changes in the character, competence, and integrity of the officer corps of the Army."[4] The "fall out" from the experience of that war continues to affect the Army, as does the continuing confusion between / substitution for management and leadership. But in any democratic institution, leadership always has the capability of transforming the institution. Let us now look for a clarification between leadership and management practices and techniques.

Leadership and Management: Clarification

If the tools, techniques, approaches, and values of management are, in fact, insufficient substitutes for the requirements and acts of leadership, then how are the key elements of leadership to be defined? I want to suggest that the leader, in any organization, at any level of that organization. if he/she is to exercise the functions of leadership, must analyze the leadership situation by raising three essential questions:[5]

what is our purpose?
who are the members of our community?
where are the loci and foci of power?

While it may seem obvious that any leader, in any situation, would have to come to grips with these questions, the fact is that most leaders are never able to raise, much less begin to answer, these key questions. There are two major reasons for this. First, no leader ever comes into a leadership position in a vacuum. The past history of his/her unit/organization/cor-

---

[2]Gabriel and Savage, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.

[3]*Ibid.*

[4]Gabriel and Savage, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[5]Warren Bennis, *The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead*, Amacon Press (New York, 1976) pp. 20-22.

poration is immediately made apparent, together with certain built-in expectations. Second, the leader is immediately faced with all of the current, ongoing expectations and requirements that make up the daily functioning of the organization. In fact, the press of routine work consistently drives out the possibility of any meaningful non-routine work, smothers creative planning, and often blocks the possibility of even considering fundamental change in the institution or organization.[6] It is precisely this "tyranny of the routine" that immerses leaders in a sea of detail; they rapidly became unable to ask the root leadership questions of purpose, community, and power that are at the heart of any institution. In other words, most *leaders* are very quickly cast into what is essentially a *management* role: handling/sorting through a myriad of routine daily organizational "inputs" and "outputs" with virtually no time to break free to function as the leader who asks the critical questions of purpose, community, and power. The leader, at any level, needs to be able to look at the "tyranny of the routine" in this way:[7]

> What elements of this routine need to be performed at all?
>
> What constitutes this institutionis/organization's constituency and community?
>
> How is its purpose defined?
>
> Wherein lies its power/authority?

Let me illustrate the way in which this works out by describing experiences I have had under two very different commanders. In the first unit I shall describe, the commander took over with the announced philosophy, "I want to get through these next 24 months as best as I can." He immediately accepted all that was then going on as a given. In order that the unit not look bad to any of the higher headquarters chain, he instituted a practice where no piece of paper was ever to leave our headquarters without his personal perusal. Work hours immediately lengthened. Headquarters personnel were required to be present not later than 0700 and leave not sooner than 1730; no one was to leave until the commander left. The governing purpose of the unit became that of "getting through" the next vehicle inspection/IG/ARTEP without "any major hits." If this meant towing away and hiding non-functional vehicles, so be it. The important thing was that "the indicators have got to look good." Morale began to drop. Key officers and NCO's began to experience "burn-out" from the normal 14-our workdays, and the not-unusual 16-18 hour workdays, Saturday's included. The problem was that this commander decided to try to personally *manage* the entire battalion, rather than to *command.* He managed, he did not lead; and he chose to attempt to manage by using a centralizing

---

[6]Bennis, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[7]*Ibid.*

process that simply could not work, given the situation of that unit.

In the second unit that I shall describe, the commander arrived with the statement, "These next 24 to 36 months are going to be the best in my life in the Army. They are also going to be the best for you, the members of this unit. We are going to work hard; we are going to play hard; we are going to get the job done, and we are going to have fun doing it." We had all heard this before! In this instance, it turned out to be true. This commander initially got all of his subordinate commanders and staff together and asked the question, "Why are we here? What is the purpose of this unit? How well are we taking care of our people? Where are our areas of weakness? What should we stop doing that we are doing? What should we start to do that we are not doing?" The effect upon the unit was as if it had been hit by a thunderbolt. "Chaplain, is this guy *serious*?" I was asked repeatedly. "Does he *really* want to know what we think we don't need to be doing?" While some members of the unit refrained from taking part, the vast majority of the unit's members responded very favorably to the commander's questions. Responses began to flow in, both formally and informally. Nothing was dismissed out of hand. Everyone got a response back, formal or informal, but personal and specific. Morale skyrocketed. Mission performance made spectacular gains. Even the drudgery of vehicle maintenance became a matter of pride in performance. What had happened was that this unit got a commander who chose leadership over management as a method. He took charge. He asked the root questions, and he was willing to eliminate meaningless activities that did not support the answers to the questions of purpose, community, and power. He was willing to "go to bat" for his people. He was crystal clear in what he expected at every level. And when he was complimented on his battalion, he would shake his head and say, "It has taken the Army about 200 years to develop its command and staff system, It's a *proven* system. It *works*. The shame of it is that so many people insist on substituting *their* systems for this one. All that does is mess everything up!" This commander understood, and practiced, leadership. What he accomplished was the "opening up" of what a lot of officers and NCO's had come to regard as a "closed" system. The chain-of-command became a two-way street. The whole unit responded positively to a leader who insisted on taking that role for himself, and who, equally, insisted on using that role for the benefit of the whole unit, and not just for himself.

I do not mean to suggest in this section of this article that good management is somehow not needed in an organization—and especially in the Army! But it must be seen that the tools and techniques of management cannot be substituted for the basic requirements, principles, and actions of leadership. Sound management principles ought to be used to apply the results that come out of good leadership. Good leadership requires the leader to ask, and push for answers to, the root questions of purpose, community, and power. As purpose is refined/redefined, and as community is identified and re-created; and as power is identified, and made the

proper servant of purpose, then good management is needed to organize and apply the specifics that flow out of the raising of the basic leadership questions. I submit that this is the proper function of management, and particularly so is it the proper relationship between leadership and management in the Army. Good, even creative, management of the routine does not constitute leadership. Leadership needs to be exercised at every level of the institution, by rising above every given routine, and by insisting that the root questions of purpose, community, and power be seriously examined.

I believe that this is precisely what General David C. Jones, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was discussing in a recent interview in the Army Times:[8]

> Today's military needs a personnel structure that emphasizes unit cohesion and restores a special community feeling among service members...
> Commanders should turn more of their attention to the needs of their people, and worry less about filling in the squares for their next promotion...
> Good, competent, stable leadership, building a cohesive unit, is the most important factor you can have...
> Commanders win the confidence of their people when their people can see that the commander is not trying to fill in the squares, not trying to impress people, but is trying to have a good outfit ...
> If commanders will be more concerned about what their people think of them than what their superiors think of them, they will have a better outfit. I don't mean currying favor with your people. I don't mean being a soft guy. But having high standards, insisting on high standards, insisting on the integrity of the system, that you are doing your best to have a good outfit, as opposed to playing games or trying to look good to somebody....

General Jones speaks of "having high standards," "insisting on high standards," "insisting on the integrity of the system," and "doing your best to have a good outfit, not just 'filling in the squares'." These statements get at the question of values and standards, which is another key function of traditional and competent leadership in the Army. Let us move now to a discussion of values and standards, and how these are interrelated with questions of leadership and management.

Ethical Considerations for Leadership

One of the most encouraging things I have discovered in doing the reading for this article is how every reflective author I have read has made a primary, binding linkage between leadership and ethics. Let me illustrate this with quotations from four authors, each of whom has a different kind of perspective on leadership, yet each of whom makes a strong ethics/values tie to leadership, and makes that tie not so much out of theory as out of experience.

---

[8]General David C. Jones, interview in "The Army Times," 26 October 1981, pp. 1, 31, 36.

Warren Bennis (*The Unconscious Conspiracy*):

> Above all, the task for today's leader is to create not only a climate of ethical probity, but a climate in which it is possible for the people around him to grow and continue learning, in which contributions are prized, and independence and autonomy are encouraged...[9]

Douglas Kinnard (Brigadier General, USA, Retired, *TRhe War Managers*):

> Perhaps the main lesson of the Vietnam War is that the (Army) system will have to permit more dissent without exacting the sacrifice of careers as the price...[10]

Gabriel and Savage (*Crisis in Command*):

> How did the officer corps of the US Army get into such a situation of disintegration? This could only have happened in a military structure which has consistently failed to develop an ethical doctrine of resistance...the Vietnam era witnessed the development of an officer corps whose members acquiesced in policies, orders, and actions with which many strongly disagreed, but supported nevertheless, as a means of career advancement...[11]

General of the Army Omar N. Bradley:

> A leader must have Character. He must possess high ideals. He must stand by those ideals. He must be able to be trusted absolutely. A man's Character is the reality of himself.[12]

Each of these four statements rests upon two presuppositions. The first is that there exists a generally-agreed-upon-and-supported concept of what constitutes "rightness." The second is that there is a community, institution, organization, etc., that shares a common, if broad, value base, a base which leads toward or points toward the commonly-held definition of "rightness." Both the Army and our society in general face the same difficulty here: neither of these two presuppositions can be said to be operative generally on any scope that approaches the "general acceptance scale" of the pre-1960's. What has happened is that there has been a major fragmentation of a previously held values base. While each of us can point to various groups within the national population who hold values either supportive or antithetical to our own, it is impossible today to specify the elements of a publicly-recognized and supported concept of what constitutes "rightness." The unacknowledged and often operative principle is that of utility or expediency, "if it works, it's right" attitude, which I submit is the unexamined theoretical base of much of management practice today, including management in the Army. It is, in my opinion, a further weakening of the place of leadership in the Army institution. This weakening has come about not at all deliberately, but as a consequence of a slow substitu-

---

[9]Warren Bennis, *The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead*, Amacon Press (New York, 1976), p. 139.

[10]Douglas Kinnard, *The War Managers*, (University of Vermont, 1977), p. 160.

[11]Richard Gabriel and Paul Savage, *Crisis in Command*, Hill and Wang (New York, 1978), p. 98.

[12]General Omar N. Bradley, "On Leadership," *Parameters*, September 1981.

tion of management techniques for leadership principles, together with a huge upheaval in American society, symbolized by the protests and their aftermath of the 1960's, and the societal effects of the Vietnam War of the 1960's and 1970s'. I believe that four things have happened in this period that have left leadership in general, and leadership in the Army in particular, without its historically strong foundation of an ethical base. First, ethical bases for leadership were assumed to exist, were therefore left largely unarticulated, and therefore fell to the concern, or lack of concern, of the individual leader. Second, ethical bases were often unrecognized in any form, and particularly so the more management tools and techniques were substituted for, instead of being used in conjunction with, leadership principles. Third, some leaders who did seek to define an ethical base for their actions did so in too narrow a manner, leaving both them and their subordinates with the feeling, "Oh well, ethics just doesn't work in this situation." Fourth, many ethical assumptions have been based on the previous reality of a commonly shared broad value base, a reality which can hardly be said to exist today.

If it appears that this may be too harsh a statement to make concerning ethics and values in the Army, I offer the following as evidence that the changes described above have indeed taken place, and affect both the officer and enlisted sides of the house in the Army.

Charles C. Moskos, Jr., Professor of Sociology at Northwestern University, has been thinking and writing about realities and trends in the US Army for a number of years. It is he who has pointed out that the Army appears to be undergoing a transformation from an "institution" to an "occupation." Moskos ties this largely to the creation of the All-Volunteer Force, beginning in 1973.[13] Moskos' point is that an institution stresses professional and institutional values, traditions, and prerogatives that define the way of life of a member of that institution; an occupation is seen as a job, usually linked to current or market-place values, with no sense of "calling to serve" involved.[14] What the "occupation" or "marketplace" approach does to values, as contrasted with the "institutional" or "calling to serve" approach, is of very critical concern. That concern is heightened by the fact that an unexamined utilitarian ethic seems to be at the base of a great deal that we do. I believe that this concern was very much on the mind of General David C. Jones, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when he testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on 28 January 1981, concerning problems faced by the All-Volunteer Force:

> When created, the AVF was linked to market-place values, and the consequence of this has been an erosion of the professional and institutional values, traditions. and prerogatives that define the profession of arms as a

---

[13]Charles C. Moskos, Jr., "The Enlisted Ranks in the All-Volunteer Army," in *The All-Volunteer Force and American Society*, John B. Keeley, ed., University of Virginia Press (Charlottesville, 1978), Section II.

[14]Charles C. Moskos, Jr. "How The AVF Might Be Made To Survive," article in *The Army Times*, 15 December 1980.

> "calling to serve" rather than a "job."
> By de-emphasizing discipline, esprit, and service to-nation-above-self, in favor of a market-force appeal to self-interest, the architects of the current system created enormous pressures on the officers and enlisted professionals charged with the training, discipline, morale, welfare, and combat readiness of our armed forces...

General Jones further called for a "fundamental reassessment of the incentives for national service."[15]

Where does this leave us in terms of our question of values, ethics, and leadership? My own perception is that it leaves us with a very long way to go. I suggest that we must begin with a recognition of the fact that at the present, we, the members of the Army (and this is equally true of we, the members of society, as well) neither have, nor share a commonly defined and accepted values base. This is not to say that there are no values; it is to say that there is not a strong "within-the-Army" consensus on what those values are and what implications they have for the practice of the principles of leadership. We are, therefore, driven back to the basics to deal with the knotty issues of leadership and ethics. Here is how I think we could begin.

Re-Establishing Both Leadership and Ethics

If we are right that, at least for the Army, leadership and ethics are inextricably tied together, then we ought to use that interrelatedness to help us solve our problem. My proposed first step is to clearly understand and differentiate the principles and practices of leadership from the tools and techniques of management. Not only will this give us a much clearer focus on who should be doing what; it will also allow the people in positions of leadership, all up and down the chain of command, to ask the root questions of both leadership and ethical concerns. The time, place, and ability to ask the root questions of purpose, community, and power is the indispensable first step.

My proposed second step is for leaders at every level to recognize that the ethical question is best asked in the corporate, as contrasted to the individual, context. If I am a leader, there is a tremendous ethical difference in my asking, "How can *I* assure *my* survival with a good record in this unit?" or in my asking, "What can *we* do to make this a better unit for all *our* people, in both mission performance and personal life?" I can find a way to justify almost anything if I keep my focus on an instrumental, utilitarian, personal concern. My vision is forced into a much broader perspective if I must step significantly outside of my own concerns to meet the concerns and needs of others. This begins to address the old issues of professional standards, as contrasted to instrumental, for-the-moment, practices and procedures. Let me illustrate this concept with one further quotation from Gabriel and Savage:

---

[15]General David C. Jones, Testimony before the United States Senate Committee on the Armed Forces, 28 January 1981, as reported in *The Army Times*, 2 February 1981.

> The cumulative impact of this change in ethical perspectives within the military (from community sacrifice, service to one's comrades to a personalized utilitarianism) has been to bring about the rise and emulation of "the officer as entrepeneur," the man adept at managing his own career by manipulating the system, mastering its technology, usually defined in terms of administrative or managerial techniques, having his "ticket punched," and achieving the "tight" assignments... the entrepeneurial officer and the ethics which motivate him remain one of the major problems affecting the Army officer corps.[16]

This description is what Charles Moskos calls the occupational, as contrasted to the institutional, model of the military system (in our case, particularly the Army). The issue, in these terms, is this: Are we to view ourselves as professionals who serve within a living institution, or are we to view ourselves essentially as hired hands who could just as easily transfer our talents and abilities to some other occupation that could use many of our skills? For Army officers and NCO professionals, this is the tough question that we have to face.

My proposed third step toward a solution of this leadership/ethics bind is this: that as root questions are asked, and answers honestly explored; and as leaders begin to put their ethical questions into a corporate, rather than an individual or private, context; then, through this very process, we who constitute the leadership corps of the Army will begin once again to create, and re-discover, the professional community, the calling-to-serve, the responsibility, the honor, and the duty which will re-shape the Army into a bond. This will be a long process, and will require assistance from the very top levels of Army leadership, as well as enthusiastic responsiveness at every level in the Army to that assistance. However, this process is best begun at the battalion level of the Army, and should flow upward from there. The hard truth is that the best sense of corporate and responsible ethical practice will develop and emerge only as the sense of the Army as an ongoing institution, as an honorable and loyalty-demanding profession, begins to reassert itself. But this kind of self-giving understanding can only emerge and develop when the root leadership questions of purpose, community, and power are asked and answered in a mutual, sharing, supportive way.

There are other approaches in trying to deal with this extremely complex questions of leadership and ethics. It is my belief that any attempt to answer these questions, without recognizing the background that is discussed here, is doomed to repeat the past errors that have gotten us into the difficult situation we face today. There have been several calls for a "professional code" for the Army. What happens when such a code is called for, without first doing the hard work of examination of both leadership and ethical practices, is illustrated in General Maxwell D.

---

[16]Gabriel and Savage, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

Taylor's article, "A Do-It-Yourself Professional Code for the Military."[17] General Taylor takes a strictly individualist/instrumentalist view of such a code. He suggests that the way to begin is to "arrive at an accepted standard of excellence for an ideal officer in the military profession."[18] Here is General Taylor's definition of such an officer:

> The ideal officer is one who can be relied upon to carry out all assigned tasks and missions and, in doing so, get the most from his available resources with minimum loss and waste... he recognizes... that success will depend on his ability to carry out all missions assigned by proper authority... in short, he takes the established standard for his goal and undertakes to meet its conditions.[19]

General Taylor goes on to ask how this officer can serve in "resolving the moral problems of the officer corps."[20] General Taylor says that because this officer's continuing commitment is to mission success, this commitment will call forth "truthfulness and integrity," the moral courage to eliminate officers who fail to meet the required standard of performance, and a willingness to work within the system for change, or to resign or retire before "going public" with any criticism of the system.[21] This officer would not be greatly concerned, says General Taylor, over the possibility of an unjust or aggressive war: "he knows... that there is no authoritative definition of either kind of war... (this officer) should assume the rightness of a governmental decision involving the country in war."[22] General Taylor concludes with this statement."[23]

> A comprehensive professional code needs to be created by bona fide military professionals who understand the requirements of leadership in war... we have found no need to invoke extra-professional help to support our conclusions and judgments. Nor have we been obliged to call on any of the great names of philosophy, ethics, or religion to justify our interpretation of our life's work. The voice of long experience tells us that, in our profession, that which favors mission success is right or good and that which works to the contrary is wrong or bad. We need not look elsewhere for confirmation of what, for a soldier, is a self-evident truth.

I believe that our experience has shown that General Taylor is much too optimistic in his belief that commitment to mission success will cause the emergence of truthfulness and integrity. The situation we face today is unpleasant testimony to the fact that such is not always the case. If we elect to stay with a kind of individualistic instrumentalism, then I see little to criticize in General Taylor's proposal, If, however, we elect to move toward

---

[17]General Maxwell D. Taylor, USA, Retired, "A Do-It-Yourself Professional Code For The Military," in *Parameters*, (the Journal of the US Army War College), Volume X, No. 4 (December 1980). pp. 10-15.

[18]Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[19]Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[20]Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

[21]Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13

[22]Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[23]Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

the development of a professional community, from which can emerge some transcendent values, then the kind of ethical base that allows mission success to be the sole criterion is inappropriate. I believe that we have stayed too long with the "if it works, it's right" approach. I believe that this approach has characterized if not caricatured, our professional community for too long. It is precisely that approach that has helped to get us into the leadership/ethical difficulty that we now experience and recognize.

The road back that I have proposed is not an easy one, nor is it one on which constant progress is likely to be made. It is a road, however, that takes very seriously the need for competent leadership and honest ethics to be intertwined, and not estranged, We need not shun the counsel of the "great names of philosophy, ethics, or religion" as we seek to set the highest possible standards for both leadership and ethics. For, as Gabriel and Savage observe,

> "There seems to be no convincing historical reason why the American military cannot develop a highly integrative subsystem commanded by an officer corps whose standards of honor, duty, and responsibility transcend, but do not threaten, the social values of the larger social order..."[24]

Who knows? Perhaps that officer corps could develop such standards that would positively influence the "larger social order" in which they also exist!

---

[24]Gabriel and Savage, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

Select Questions in Bio-Medical Ethics

Chaplain (MAJ) John A. Rasmussen, USAR

1984 rushes at us with blinding, dazzling, paralyzing speed. A decade ago, Alvin Toffler impressed the world with his best selling book, *Future Shock*. Presently, shocking changes do occur in the fields of medicine, life, death, and human engineering. We live in future life.

Today, we experience a deluge of topics on life tomorrow. Life tomorrow happens today. Man has longed to control his fate, as well as captain his soul. Undeniably, now man stands on the verge of playing a most profound role in the shaping of his future image. We live in a time of frightening medical changes and human engineering—a time when man manipulates man. Our contemporary times spawn a myriad of moral and ethical questions. The medical and religious disciplines ask: To what degree shall we play God? What kind of a man shall we create? How far should medical technicians and human engineers advance in changing the constitution of the human being? Today, we only see the tip of the bio-medical iceberg as it begins to emerge. This paper seeks to probe, question and raise the consciousness of the readers in the field of bio-medical ethics. Additionally, the writer hopes this article particularly stimulates the clergy to study the issues.

The 80's

We live in the eighties. Excitement and change describe this new decade—a decade which contains uncertainties for all—a decade of 1984—a decade when many of George Orwell's prophecies find fulfillment. Aldous Huxley's caste system of *Brave New World* fame looms as a nightmarish possibility in the near future. Undeniably, we live in a time of adjusting to a world that continues to change rapidly. If we do not adjust to these changes because of personal unwillingness or psychological inability, we may become the victims of what Toffler calls "future shock."[1]

If we become victims of a social psychosis, which refuses to con-

[1]Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Random House, 1971), 2.

Chaplain Rasmussen is a Lutheran (Missouri Synod) clergyman, now a USAR Chaplain, who served three years as a hospital chaplain at Madigan Army Medical Center. He holds a M.Div. Degree from Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, and an M. A. from Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington. He served the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit at Madigan, and had been involved in panel discussions and in-service education in the field of medical ethics. He is now a parish pastor in Lubby, Montana, and has had several articles published in the field of medical ethics.

sciously address the challenges of the day, we imitate the lemmings, rushing to their mass suicide. We fail ourselves and our posterity if we fail to give adequate direction for the future in the field of bio-medical ethics.

Death—A Crisis Issue

Before we can even address the future, we must address the most universal issue of the present, death. In the medical arena, professionals ask: Who shall live and who shall die? Some years ago at the Sonoma Conference on Ethical Issues in Neonatal Intensive Care, the question arose: Would it ever be right to intervene directly to kill a self-sustaining infant? Of the 20 medical professionals asked this question, 17 said it would be right to intervene directly to kill this infant, while two said no, and one was uncertain.[2] One of the three criteria for making this judgment was the evaluation that the infant was defective and unwanted by parents and unneeded by society. One doesn't need to probe deeply to see the awesome ramifications of killing humans because they are unwanted by parents and unneeded by society.

Two decades ago, the question would never have been raised among medical professionals, but today it is there and demands an answer. Recently, ethical questions arose concerning medical care and death. For example, do we preserve a body with mechanical devices solely for the purpose of being a good donor for a future organ transplant for an unknown or unrelated person? Does treatment become torture when it fails in its therapeutic effect? Is it ethical for a patient to unknowingly serve as a human medical guinea pig? When death is undisputedly imminent, do we continue to give medical treatment? If consciousness disappears, does life (quality life) still exist? The chicken with its head severed from its body, still running around the barnyard, does not display quality life. If the body vegetates and cannot be restored, do we define this as meaningful life or do we define this as life whose value is similar to that of the chicken.

The military chaplain might well ask: At what point do we have life devoid of human value? Do we currently maintain such life in our Veteran Administration hospitals? This question, of paramount importance, goes begging a good answer. A soldier's good morale is often proportionately related to his feeling about his health care. Will the military spare no cost in giving him the very best of medical care as it has done in the past for its soldiers or will the soldier of tomorrow have the idea (real or imagined) that he might be cannibalized for organ transplant purposes? These questions are crucial and vital to an effective and dedicated Army of the future. From the medical arena emerge ethical questions which require answers today. The myriad of questions continues to mount; the good answers remain few—some frightening and many unexplored. When we choose the path to life in the future, we must keep our minds open in that quest for solid solutions to complex problems of life and death.

---

[2]Albert R. Jonsen and Michael J. Garland, *Ethic of Newborn Intensive Care* (San Francisco: University of California, San Francisco, 1976), 188.

Human Engineering

Today, human engineers ask, what kind of child should be given life? This is a reality of the 80's. Genetic experts estimate that approximately 250,000 defective births occur annually in the United States and 20 per cent of the parents of these defective children have a history of genetic defects.[3] Should the clergy counselor (chaplain) encourage or attempt to persuade couples to have themselves sterilized if they know that they carry genetic maladies? Should contraception, tubal ligation or vasectomies be suggested to couples to prevent future pregnancies when genetic tests indicate that future children have a high degree of probable genetic defects? Millions of couples fall into this category. Geneticists have identified more than 2300 distinct genetic defects.[4]

Should human engineering be employed at conception? Should the sex of the child be selected? Dr. Carlsen and Dr. Shettles have had seeming success in producing a child of the desired sex.[5] What happens when an imbalance of sexes takes place?

Artificial insemination by donor (AID) warrants our consideration. Estimates among the U.S. medical profession run from 200,000 up to 500,000 annual inseminations with 5—50,000 new AID babies born each year.[6] The exact tabulation is not known because of the secrecy involved in AID fertilizations. The issue is clouded further because some doctors use the same donor for AID fathering. Doctors report that average AID donors produce six pregnancies with the extreme of 50 children being fathered by a single AID donor. Since most doctors practice medicine in a localized geographic setting, this raises the spector of half brothers and sisters innocently marrying one another.

Further, would an AID conception cause a husband to feel inferior and worsen a marital relationship? Does an AID child have legal right to his biological father's estate? What happens if the mother and father die and their blood relatives fight for legal disposition of the estate? Does a third party (the sperm donor or a surrogate mother) have a legal claim to the estate? Dr. H. J. Muller, a Nobel Prize winner called on prospective parents to forego "egotistical" desires to reproduce their own heredities, and instead, to help advance the human race by constructing children from the "best" available egg and sperm.[7]

The noted Protestant theologian, Helmet Thielicke, stands opposed to AID. He feels that marriage conveys exclusive bodily rights to sexual and reproductive organs and that AID violates those rights. He also claims

---

[3]Craig W. Ellison, "Engineering Humans," *Christianity Today*, 23, No. 3, (Jan 1979), 14.

[4]Lane P. Lester with James C. Hetley, *Cloning—Miracle or Menace?* (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 1980), 97.

[5]*Ibid.*, 54.

[6]*Ibid.*, 79.

[7]"Babies Made to Order: How to Stir a Tempest in a Test Tube," *Chicago Daily News*, (September 20, 1974).

that AID threatens marriage because it fulfills motherhood at the expense of confirming failure of the father.[8]

Following Dr. Muller's approach to genetic engineering, one must ask if he desires to produce the Brave New World humans. Will we by intention and design beget the elite alpha types and the epsilon worker types to which Huxley alludes.

The Life Selection Process

The pre-natal diagnostic technique amniocentesis can serve as a human engineering tool. Simply stated, amniocentesis is the procedure to drawing a small amount of amniotic fluid which surrounds the unborn baby. Through the analysis of this fluid, numerous diagnostic predictions can be made. If amniocentesis shows the unborn baby defective then the mother and/or father have to make life decisions. Should the baby be permitted birth or should it be aborted. Joseph Fletcher says that since we would terminate a defective baby in utero, why not logically kill it after it has been born.[9] Taken a step further, why not terminate a defective new born after medical efforts have failed to produce a healthy infant at one, six, or twelve months of life. At one conference on neo-natal ethics, 90% of the neo-natal intensive care professionals felt it would be right to displace a poor diagnosis infant in order to provide intensive care to a better prognosis infant.[10]

It appears today that through direct manipulation of our genes, someday we will be able to prevent certain types of genetic defects. Since the U.S. Supreme Court says we can legally dispose of the "undesired product" of conception (abortion), the disposal of undesired results of genetic surgery poses no ethical barrier for many human engineers. A genetically created laboratory monster is easily destroyed with little or no fear of judicial process.

Cloning, though not a new idea, further complicates the situation. We know that plants have been cloned from cuttings for years. Frogs were cloned over a decade ago. Today there is considerable research in cloning of mice.[11]

Whether fact or fiction, David Rorvik caught the attention of the world with his book, *In His Image*, in which he claimed that man had already been cloned in secret. If possible, are there advantages to having a cloned human? From a military perspective, a clone might serve well as a soldier. Having no parents he wouldn't suffer from separation symptoms as acutely as do soldiers today. He could be raised in a state operated military academy and taught total obedience to the state. The cloned

---

[8]Harmon Smith, *Ethics and the New Medicine*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), 72 & 73.

[9]John Fletcher, "Abortion, Euthanasia, and Care of Defective Newborns," *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 292, No. 2 (Jan 1975), 76.

[10]Jonsen & Garland, *Op. Cit.*, 191.

[11]"Scientific Feat: Test Tube Mice," *U.S. News & World Report* (19 Jan 81) p. 7.

soldier could be produced for the ordinary distasteful or dangerous military occupational specialties. Morale would rise. Professionalism would increase. Placed in the hands of a despot, cloning could produce monstrous results for an individual or a nation. The question is raised as to what type of person should be produced through cloning. Do we want the Barbie Doll, the Marlboro Man, the Einstein intellect, or the unquestioning soldier?

Motherhood

When days were simple, the question of laboratory motherhood never arose. Today however, we can bring about life in a test tube where the human egg and sperm are combined "in vitro," under glass. The impregnated egg can then be placed in a receptive female recipient and she can carry the child to viable birth. Such was the case when test-tube baby, Louise Brown, was born in England July 18, 1978. Practically speaking, if a woman cannot conceive because her fallopian tubes are blocked, what prevents her egg and her husband's sperm from being united "in vitro" and then placed in her receptive womb? Morally speaking, what then prevents a surrogate mother from carrying the baby conceived "in vitro" to term? Morally, what is the degree of difference between that type of fertilization and pregnancy and the biblical fertilization and pregnancy of Hagar by Abraham? Abraham desired a child and since his wife Sarah was barren, he fathered a child by sexual intercourse with his servant Hagar. (Genesis 16:4) Does not surrogate motherhood offer a more acceptable modern answer to the age old barreness of the Old Testament? Surrogate motherhood produces further questions. Whose child is it? Can the surrogate mother kill it through abortion? If you accept the premise that a woman has the right over her own body, why can't she kill that which she carries in her own body, although she is a surrogate mother? In the anticipated case of abortion, should the donors be consulted?

The moral and ethical questions arise anew in the case of ectogenesis, (life created outside the womb). If human life is created in the laboratory, and sustained in the laboratory, how long should it be continued? What should be done if it appears that a defective (monster) is being created? In the case of abnormal birth, who should raise the baby? Should the laboratory technician who raised the baby (ectogenesis), the donors of the sperm and egg from which the life came, or the corporation or government agency who funded the procedure have the right of parenthood?

If as the baby grows, can desired behavior be expected? Should drugs, electrical therapy, or surgical procedures be employed to attempt to produce a desired behavior pattern? If all else fails, can entire brain segments be replaced? Dr. Robert White, a Cleveland neurosurgeon, has replaced not merely brains, but the entire heads of animals no less than 35 times in the last 10 years.[12] Is this acceptable procedure in human beings?

---

[12]Frederick E. Trinklein, "The Mental Altering of Life," *The Lutheran Witness*, 100, No. 3 (March 1981) p. 11.

It is imperative that clergy ask what are the goals and aims of the human engineers? What manipulation should be permitted? Some social planners have actually suggested that a type of human be bred with no legs, so as to facilitate space travel. It is reasoned that an astronaut without legs required less room in a space vehicle.[13] How far should we allow biological manipulation to change the basic structure of the human? Do we manipulate the machine or does the machine manipulate us as in the case of the legless astronaut?

It is ironic that man, to greater and lesser degrees, falls victim to his own advances. Today we live in an environment of contradictions because medical and scientific advances are not salutary as they first appear. For example, advances in medicine now allow a young patient with cystic fibrosis to live through puberty with the potential of procreating. Two generations ago, without medical care, the victim of cystic fibrosis would have had no chance to procreate because death would have come before puberty was reached. As a result of medical and scientific advances, today and in the future, we will introduce "deficiencies" (genetic mutants) into the human gene pool. Correspondingly, an increasing amount of genetically diseased will have an opportunity to multiply themselves because medical science gives them a longer lifespan. What do we do with the diabetic, hemopheliac, and other genetic disease carriers? Should carriers be cautioned that they stand a far greater risk of giving birth to children with birth anomolies than do genetically healthy parents? Is the gene pool being polluted because of our medical advances? If so, then what? Some revered medical sages proclaim that too much compassion to one generation can be an act of oppression to the next. They deplore the idea of mutants reproducing.[14]

We now stand on the threshold of a future with nightmarish possibilities. Change is inevitable. Again we ask, what in man should change and what should remain constant and inviolable? This area particularly needs the attention of the clergy. As we advance into the 80's, perhaps too rapidly, we find ourselves facing the ambiguity of progress. What is the responsibility of the professional in religion and ethics? Do we merely acknowledge the ambiguity of advancement and accept the future, whatever it brings, or do we insist the progress take a controlled course?

The clergyman must be involved in the decision making process. He had best give input during the bio-medical decision making process. As in the case of the cystic fibrosis or diabetic, he should intelligently arrive at a religious consensus, knowing whether or not to sensitize parents to the needs of genetic counseling. He must know why he favors or opposes

---

[13]Helmut Thielicke, *The Doctor as Judge of Who Shall Live and Who Shall Die* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 4.

[14]Robert Williams, *To Live and To Die: When, Why and How* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1973), 85.

sterilization. His peers speak loudly and clearly. Some medical and social experts oppose even bringing to birth those who would be mentally retarded or suffer various degrees of abnormality. Some have intentionally let these children die. This present reality Dr. Everett Koop states in his book, *The Right to Live; the Right to Die.* Babies with mongolism have been allowed to starve to death rather than surgically removing an intestinal obstruction.[15] Some would abort these humans in utero. Others would advocate killing the new born after birth (infanticide).

What is the criteria for letting a defective child live? Are viability and sociability adequate criteria for permitting and assisting life to continue with medical care? If socialization constitutes the basis for allowing one to live, do we listen seriously to Joshua Lederberg. Lederberg has proposed that

> ...an operationally useful point of divergence of the developing organism (infant) would be at approximately the first year of life, when the human infant continues his intellectual development, proceeds to the acquisition of language and then participates in meaningful cognitive interaction with his mother and with the rest of society.[16]

The seminarian, clergyman and theologian had best be involved in the decision-making process in these life issues, or else he will soon find himself muted and muzzled in his own backyard of religion, morality and ethics.

Is Man Dependable

Let's be perfectly honest with ourselves and ask: Can we depend on man to do that which serves his own best interest in the field of engineering humans? A cursory glance at Scripture gives some strong indicators. Genesis 3 tells of the insatiable desire of man to be the center of his own universe. Since the creation man has been in contention with God, his fellow man, and nature. The society shaking divorce rate demonstrates how he cannot even stay in a loving relationship with one he has promised to love for life.

Today, man challenges God as never before because he is able to control his destiny within limits. The biblical narrative, Genesis 3:5 reads: "For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." And man knows good and evil, but he is not however God. Man has still an undying propensity to be egocentric, greedy and jealous. One of the first brothers raised a clenched fist against his brother, and destroyed him.

The Egyptian pharaoh of the Old Testament, when he saw that the Jewish slaves were growing in threatening numbers, killed all the male children at birth (infanticide). The pharaoh said to the Hebrew midwives,

---

[15]C. Everett Koop, *The Right to Live: The Right to Die.* (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 1976), 91.

[16]H. T. Engelhardt, "Viability, Abortion, and the Difference Between a Fetus and an Infant," *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 116 (June 1973), p. 431.

"When you serve as midwife to the Hebrew women, and see them upon the birthstool, if it is a son, you shall kill him; but if it is a daughter, she shall live." (Exodus 1:15-16.) Again, when a civic leader in the New Testament era perceived that he was politically threatened he called for the assasination of his rival. The Scriptures read, "Then Herod.... sent and killed all the male children in Bethlehem and in all that region who were two years old and under." (Matthew 2:16.) There followed wailing and loud lamentation. In both cases, the weak and defenseless died at the hands of the powerful.

What is the degree of difference between those killings and the killing of the undesirables of the 70's and 80's. The moral fiber of today's world has not changed appreciably from the past. Life is still cheap for many today. Man has a good reason to be jittery today because he has been so totally unpredictable in the past. When man has power to create and destroy he needs societal parameters in which to operate.

The Social Planner

We as clergy must become aware of the potential of advancement in the fields of medicine and biology because of its two edged sword effect. Only if we are aware of the two edged effect of that sword will we have the tools to evaluate and criticize the well-intentioned, though often ill-informed social planners of our day, and more importantly of our children's days. People today, respected and influential men, seek to breed a super-man and a super-race. We face the difficulty if not impossibility, of separating the benevolent and benign plans from the despotic and demonic.

Robert H. Williams of the University of Washington wrote the following in his article, "Propagation, Modification and Termination of Life":

> If, too, there is the possibility of a genetic disorder that can bring mental or physical suffering, having children can perpetuate the trouble into further generation... Therefore, the likely disadvantages should be compared with the advantages before pregnancies are initiated or continued. Too much compassion by society for one generation can produce oppression on the next... Ordinarily, it is assumed that each individual has the freedom and right to reproduce whenever and wherever he chooses. Every effort should be made to change public opinion through enlightenment, tradition, pleas and various incentive plans. However, we must be prepared to use legal measures if necessary.[17]

A host of highly educated social planners, in total agreement with Dr. Williams and his utilitarian philosophy of propagation, take him very seriously. The question must be asked, where does this road lead for the minorities and the abnormal people? Another social planner addressed the same issue of propagation. He said:

> ...The state must act as the guardian of a millennial future in the face of which the wishes and the selfishness of the individual must appear as nothing

---

[17]Robert Williams, *Op. Cit.*, p. 85.

> and submit. It must put the most modern medical means in the service of this knowledge. It must declare unfit for propagation all who are in any way visibly sick or who have inherited a disease and therefore pass it on... Those who are physically and mentally unhealthy and unworthy must not perpetuate their suffering in the body of their children.[18]

Adolph Hitler, the author of these words, sought a utopian society. Using a utilitarian principle, his words only underscore how abortion, infanticide and euthanasia are lethal weapons in the hands of unscrupulous social planners.

The issues are not peculiar to Nazi Germany. Dr. Stahlman underscores the acuteness of the situation for medicine today. He says:

> I believe, as a physician who has had prior contact with the family, that I can persuade 99 percent of parents to my way of thinking if I really work at it, even if I am 100 percent wrong. If I tell them in such a way that I appear concerned and that I am knowledgeable and that I have their interest at heart and the interest of their fetus or their newborn baby, there is no question in my mind but what they will let me "cut off that infant's head".[19]

If the social planners do begin to sever the head from the body, who will hold them accountable. Martin Luther stated: "It is the job of the magistrate to uphold the law of God and it is the job of the preacher to hold him to do so..." Clergy had best hear this saged admonition.

1984 rushes at us with blinding, dazzling, paralyzing speed. Future shock will be here if we don't take precautions to prevent that shock. Today the seminarian, pastor, chaplain, counselor and theologian must face the myriad of medical-ethical challenges. We owe it to our posterity; otherwise, who will decide what constitutes a societal defect and what is a normal societal difference.

---

[18]Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1943), 404.

[19]D. Stahlman, *Ross Conference on Pediatric Research: Ethica Dilemnas in Current Obstetrics and Newborn Care* (Columbus, Ohio: Ross Laboratories, 1973), 66.

Values and the Professional Soldier

Major James L. Narel

"I believe in UFOs."
"No you don't."
"What?"
"No you don't."
"What are you saying?"
"I'm saying that you don't believe in UFOs."
"But I've just told you that I do."
"And I'm telling you that you do not."

What could be more exasperating than to have someone claim to know, better than we, what we believe? After all, our beliefs are the most personal things about us. Another person might claim to know that the subject of our belief is incorrect—for example, that UFOs do not exist—but it does not seem comprehensible that he or she could claim to know, better than we know ourselves, *what* we believe. Yet, at least in a sense, that is what this essay does. It is not an argument about UFOs, but about values, and it makes the claim, which may seem preposterous at first, that some people do not believe what they sincerely profess to believe concerning values. More particularly, it makes the claim that some people in the military do not believe what they profess about some ethical concepts relevant to their profession and, furthermore, that this confusion has important negative consequences.

Consider the following two assertions:

"I don't believe there is any ethical view that is more true, more accurate, or more valid than any other ethical view. Morality is dependent upon culture; what is right in one culture may be wrong in another, and vice versa. We usually end up professing the values of our particular society because we have been taught to see these as 'right.' Had we been raised in a substantially different environment, our ideas about morality might bear little resemblance to the ones we now have. Therefore, who is to say which ethical system is best? One view is as good as another."

A second assertion: "All ethical claims are either meaningless or

Major James L. Narel is a member of the Ethics Task Force at the Soldier Support Center, Fort Benjamin Harrison. He is a 1969 graduate of the U. S. Military Academy, and holds a masters degree in literature from the University of Massachusetts. Major Narel has had command and staff assignments in Air Defense units in Germany and Korea. He taught philosophy and ethics at the U. S. Military Academy from 1977 to 1981, and edited an academy publication, *Ethics and the Military Profession.*

hypocritical because, in the final analysis, everyone does what is in his or her own best interest. However much we claim to be interested in the welfare of others, we always put ourselves first. We serve others only after our own needs have been satisfied, and then our 'unselfish' acts are really motivated by the desire to increase our own prestige or self-satisfaction or perhaps to alleviate feelings of guilt or indebtedness. Since this is a fact of human nature, any moral claim that urges us to act out of concern for others is a sham."

These two opinions are voiced frequently in discussions about values. The arguments have gained in popularity even though—or perhaps because—they reject traditional moral norms. The person who expresses one or the other view seems to imply that he has advanced beyond a blind acceptance of his society's customs and codes and is able to think about these concepts in a more objective way. Furthermore, the two views enjoy added prestige because they are "realistic." Their adherents seem courageously to have abandoned the quaint and comfortable tenets of tradition and to have faced the world as it really is.

There is a sad irony in all of this. It has nothing to do with the value (or lack of value) of either view or with the increasing popularity of both. It is possible that one or the other is an accurate assessment of the true nature of morality, and the arguments do demonstrate a willingness to confront questions of value objectively. But many who voice the arguments have not examined them thoroughly. A precise and comprehensive investigation of the issues could uncover inconsistencies—not necessarily in the ethical views themselves (though that, too, is possible), but in the network of personal beliefs that includes these views. In other words, a person may conclude that, since one or the other argument sounds rational and acceptable, it must constitute his or her belief about the subject (we do tend to accept as true those propositions that appeal to our reason and involve no obvious flaw in logic). Yet that person may simultaneously hold other beliefs that contradict this one. For example, an individual who on one occasion maintains that one value system is as good as another may, at some other time, express the opinion that there is something inherently unjust about slavery. Obviously, both these beliefs cannot be consistently maintained since it is certainly possible to imagine a value system that finds slavery morally acceptable. Such a person, then, probably does not really believe that all value systems are of equal worth, even though he may sometimes think he does.

While it may be difficult to identify people who are willing to articulate a serious defense of slavery, many people in the military *are* ready to defend one of the two ethical views expressed above. Yet, in several ways, both these positions are inconsistent with the concept of the professional soldier. A person cannot consistently maintain either view and simultaneously be committed to the goals of the military profession. This is not quite as serious a problem as it may first appear because many of those people in uniform who find the views rational will, after study and

reflection, find that the views are not *actually* part of their beliefs. The issue does have important ramifications, however, since continued confusion about the beliefs can lead to serious misunderstandings of, or misjudgments about, the profession.

The view that all moral systems are ultimately subjective is called relativism. The cliche "It's all relative," when used thoughtfully in a discussion of values, means that the speaker rejects the notion that there is some objective "ground" for morality. He recognizes that most people conduct their lives in accordance with some framework of values, but he maintains that the framework is itself the product of their environment and social conditioning. As a result, when other people claim a certain action is "right," the relativist argues that they really mean that their particular culture approves of, and encourages, such behavior. If some other social group collectively disapproved, owing to its own cultural experience, the action would, in the relativist's view, be *wrong* in that setting.

There is nothing logically inconsistent about such a view of morality. It does create the possibility of a particular act's being both right and wrong at the same time, but this is not a contradiction. For a relativist the word "wrong" does not mean "violating an objectively true principle of morality"; it means, simply, "not acceptable within a particular social grouping." But a person who claims to be a relativist, if he is to avoid inconsistency, must accept all the consequences that logically derive from this normative system. This means he must be willing to admit that no action can be held to be *objectively wrong*. Cruelly abusing helpless children, for example, cannot be judged as inherently wrong; it must be viewed simply as socially unacceptable in most cultures. Furthermore, if a culture were discovered in which child abuse was routinely practiced, the consistent relativist could make no adverse judgment. He would have to maintain that there is nothing objectively wrong with the attendant human suffering; it is merely a matter of cultural preference.

Now this is not what is believed by most people who entertain the notion that morality may be relative. More likely they believe that it is not right for one person or culture to impose its value system on another. "People should be allowed to do anything they choose as long as it doesn't hurt someone else. Live and let live!" This may be a comparatively liberal viewpoint but *it is not relativism*. Such a view does not claim that *all* values are subjective. It contends that some, perhaps many, are situation- or culture-dependent, but it accepts other values as universal. The live-and-let-live doctrine implies the right of individuals and cultures to be free of unwanted interference. It urges tolerance of diverse views. It assumes that human beings have inalienable rights and that their liberty ought not arbitrarily to be curtailed.

But it might be asked whether this is not simply a semantic distinction. One may not be a relativist in the sense that it has been defined here, but if one is content to accept the values of others as being fine for them, aren't the practical consequences the same?

The distinction is real. If a person were a true relativist, he would have to admit that the values of his native culture are objectively no better and no worse than those of any other. Hence, his commitment to those values, if he felt any, could only be a matter of convenience or custom. On the other hand, the person who is committed to tolerance and respect for human rights sees these values as having objective validity. One can expect that such beliefs will influence his attitudes and behavior in a more profound way. He might he willing, for example, to accept inconvenience or even to endure danger or suffering in order to support his values.

It is difficult to imagine a thoroughgoing relativist as a dedicated military professional. A relativist might choose to engage in soldiering; indeed, he might find that the military environment is more consistent with his tastes or preferences than is the civilian world. For example, he may enjoy engaging in adventurous, dangerous, or violent acts or may feel more secure operating in a rigidly structured social hierarchy. But are these the characteristics that define the military professional? While these attitudes might partially describe him, they might also characterize a mercenary or a uniformed bureaucrat. The concept of a professional typically involves something more, namely, binding oneself to particular *principles.* This is particularly true in America, where it is not to a person that the professional soldier swears his allegiance, nor is it a geographical area that he promises to protect when he takes his public oath. Support and defense of the Constitution requires fealty to the principles, to the values, proclaimed by that document. Would it be reasonable for the person who truly believes that one declaration of values is as good as another to promise to engage in brutal combat simply because one of these allegedly arbitrary value systems is threatened or endangered? A genuine relativist would have to forego such action.

And what about the egoist? Egoism is the claim that self-interest is the focus of all human action and that a moral system, if it is to have objective validity, must take this truth into account. Like relativism, the egoistic argument may be, but is not necessarily, a correct statement about the nature of morality. But some persons who see its claims as rational and compelling may not have made a careful study of egoism and may hold other moral views inconsistent with the egoist position. This would be true of the professional soldier who *thinks* he accepts egoism but who has not reconciled it with his commitment to military values.

Because so much of what any person routinely does is motivated by self-interest, it is easy to slide into an almost unquestioned acceptance of egoism. Choosing to put on one's shoes in the morning is a 'selfish' act in the sense that the decision is made with little or no consideration of others. The same is true of one's decisions to bathe, eat, exercise, and so on. What about holding the door for someone, or picking up another person's dropped parcel? Behavior that is seemingly other-directed can also be interpreted as having a selfish motive: following rules of social etiquette, for example, will likely secure similar treatment in return and will enhance

the prestige of the polite person in the eyes of others. The argument can be extended to even the most dramatic actions, and persons who give up their lives for their comrades can be seen as doing so primarily in pursuit of an eternal reward or in a subconscious effort to alleviate personal guilt. It is man's nature to act in his own interest, the egoist claims; the dictum is universal and inexorable.

Now, this claim is not self-contradictory, and it cannot be disproven. It is not surprising, then, that many people who encounter the argument erroneously conclude that it is *necessarily* true. But an assertion that alien beings are observing mankind from another dimension is also irrefutable, since no evidence can be produced to show that it is false. One is not thereby compelled to accept the claim as true. Similarly, egoism constitutes one way of interpreting human behavior and, as a theory, it contains no absurdities or inherent contradictions. But the same can be said for many conflicting theories. Indeed, when measured against competing views, egoism is burdened in that its central tenet seems counterintuitive to most people. The egoistic argument hinges on the assertion that *all* (not simply "most") human actions are motivated by self-interest. If so much as a single event in all of human history was characterized by true selflessness, egoism would have to be considered invalid: observing that men are frequently selfish is far different from claiming they are always totally selfish, and that their nature requires them to be so. And, when one thinks about it, the argument for selfishness is not all that persuasive. It depends upon one's willingness to believe that even the most innocent act of human kindness is really determined by self-interest. Does one assist a passerby by retrieving his dropped parcel *in order* to feel good, or does one do it out of genuine consideration for the other person and then feel good after the fact? The egoist seems to be arguing that one can never know one's own mind in matters like these; if one thinks his concern for others is genuine, he must allow this opinion to be overruled by an outside observer who claims to know more about the samaritan's motives than the samaritan does.

Though the egoist's claim is not necessarily false, neither is his theory nearly so compelling as it may initially appear. It may be that many people have been maintaining two contradictory views: that all actions must be selfish (because the egoist argument cannot be refuted), but that some actions are genuinely unselfish (because they clearly seem to be motivated by concern for others). The military professional who is convinced by the egoist has probably fallen into just this predicament. His professional commitment and many of the values he supports as a member of the military, however, are inconsistent with egoism.

Why couldn't an egoist logically be a career soldier? After all, the service does have its attractive features. Moved by personal desires for a secure job, a guaranteed income, early retirement, leadership opportunities, travel, and excitement, couldn't a person decide on a military career because it satisfied his own needs? Certainly. Without doubt, satisfying

one's needs and otherwise serving one's self-interest are motives for virtually everyone choosing the service life. There is no denying that everyone is partially, and perhaps inescapably, motivated by self-interest. But could a person who is motivated *only* by self-interest pursue a military career? It is unlikely, although possible, that he could. Would such a person be a military professional? Decidedly not.

Once again one encounters the distinction between the professional and the person who soldiers only for pay. It is neither merely a semantic distinction nor a wholly arbitrary or subjective one. As the very name of the vocation implies, those who select the military *service* as a profession are placing themselves at the disposal of others. They are pledging to direct their efforts toward the national, not their personal, welfare. They will routinely be expected to subordinate their own interests to those designated by someone else as being the interests of the unit or of the nation. Without doubt those broader interests will sometimes conflict with pure self-interest. In such circumstances one could hardly expect the egoist in uniform to act like a professional. Would it be reasonable to think that a person motivated solely by self-interest would unhesitatingly obey an order that places his life in extreme danger? Or that he would be the source of such an order himself? Or, in less dramatic circumstances, that he would render a report that reflected badly on his own performance? The motivation that characterizes professional behavior in the military is frequently antithetical to egoism.

This conclusion does not imply that there are numerous egoists in uniform who ought to change careers or, at least, admit that they are unprofessional. On the contrary, there are probably very few egoists in military ranks; but those ranks may contain many dedicated, self-sacrificing professionals who pay unwitting homage to an egoist perspective that does not accurately reflect their true values.

Are there any practical consequences to these conclusions or are the implications trivial? Although military officers may not recognize the contradiction between ethical relativism or egoism and the nature of the military profession, the consequences of holding inconsistent convictions are anything but trivial. Like so many other social institutions, the military profession suffers today from a spiritual malaise that undercuts our collective confidence, saps our energy, and produces a cynicism that seems to feed on itself. The problems may be due in no small part to confusion about values.

Several of the important values traditionally espoused in the military profession have already been identified in this essay. They include commitments to uphold national principles, subordination of personal interests, obedience, courage, and loyalty. But each of these is in conflict with either relativism or egoism or both. What happens, then, when a person who thinks he is persuaded by the relativist or egoist argument attempts to commit himself to a profession that maintains the importance of values inconsistent with those theories? At best the confusion causes

only a minor diminution of moral certainty. But all too likely the consequences will be more profound. For example, the profession urges us to be prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of the values articulated by Washington, Jefferson, and others. Yet relativism tells us that, from an objective standpoint, these cannot be shown to have any greater moral merit than the values held by King George III, Mussolini, or Joseph Stalin. And while our oath of office commits us to endure danger in order to protect others, egoism claims that human nature absolutely prohibits acts of genuine self-sacrifice. If we are confident that, put to the test, we could be counted upon to act in consonance with our professional values, we are probably implying that our belief in the relativist or egoist propositions is less enduring than our patriotic or professional devotion.

Beliefs to which we cling tightly in times of crisis, we often squander foolishly when faced with subtler challenges. How do we respond, for example, to a proffered assignment that probably will not promote our career? We may acknowledge that the position needs a competent individual, but we may also prefer and suggest that it be some *other* competent individual. At moments like these, how are we likely to regard the argument that, as professionals, we ought to subordinate our personal interests to the greater common good? As we deal with the problem, our confusion about egoism or relativism can have insidious consequences. Since we do not see our colleagues rushing to sacrifice themselves, we may conclude that the egoists have it right: people do not willfully act against their self-interest. Having arrived at such a conviction, we become less ready than ever to accept the task simply because it needs to be done, and we confront a genuine conflict of beliefs. We continue to pay lip service to the profession's espoused values—in this case, call it self-sacrifice—but we are anything but convinced that self-sacrifice is actually practiced or even possible. The apparent norm—and thus the right action according to the relativist—tells us that we should not take the assignment. We convince ourselves that we cannot really be expected to acquire the virtue of self-sacrifice, and we become cynical as the virtue is preached by the hypocrites. The egoist prophecy of selfish behavior thus becomes self-fulfilled, and the most blatant forms of careerism can be rationalized as prudent and proper.

A clearer understanding of egoism and relativism will not, of course, cause careerism or other professional maladies to disappear. Such understanding can, however, reassure us that the values of the profession, the ones that may well have attracted us to service in the first place, are not illogical or unrealistic after all. We may come to doubt the opinion that all value systems are of equal merit. We may decide that a particular system may indeed be of superior worth. The result can be a renewed and heightened appreciation of the values contained in the Constitution we are pledged to defend. We may conclude as well that the egoist does not have the only explanation of human nature and that all people are not necessarily always selfish. The result can be a new willingness to see, in ourselves and others, at least the *possibility* of genuinely unselfish action. Acknowl-

edging that such behavior is possible constitutes a first step toward agreeing that it can rightly be expected of a military professional. In both cases the process begins with the recognition that neither relativists nor egoists have a corner on the truth and that competing views have much to recommend them.

While each of us is undoubtedly aware of lapses in professional behavior, by ourselves and others, we should celebrate the daily observation of performance that reflects genuine commitment to traditional values. If there is confusion in speaking about values, the actions of many people in uniform speak louder than words. People do, at least on occasion, give evidence that they can discriminate among value systems and that they can act in the interest of others even at some personal cost (while yet mistakenly claiming to agree with relativists and egoists who argue that this is not so). Clearing up the confusion can have important beneficial effects. It can reduce the temptation, when we are frustrated or disillusioned, to lower our personal standards and our expectations. It can also heighten our professional sense of self-worth by permitting us to take full credit for our dedication and self-sacrifice. We can respond with confidence to cynics and naysayers and can come to regard the profession's espousal of traditional values as noble yet realistic, demanding yet attainable.

By the Book:
The Military Ethics of General William T. Sherman

Chaplain (MAJ) John W. Brinsfield

Introduction

One might wonder why modern historians should be interested in a reappraisal of General William T. Sherman's military ethics. The morality of Sherman's military campaigns—what he did as opposed to what he allowed his subordinate commanders and troops to do—has been extensively debated for over a century. As a commander Sherman has been charged by his critics with terrorist tactics such as licensing the random execution of non-combatants, destroying and pillaging private property, and even plotting Indian genocide.[1] Sherman's troops, protected by the moral indifference of their Commander-in-Chief during both the Civil War and the Indian Wars, according to his censurers, were guilty of murder, theft, arson, gang rape, and the desecration of cemeteries and burial grounds.[2]

During the Atlanta Campaign, for example, General W.P. Howard of the Georgia State Militia reported to Governor Joseph Brown that "The crowning act of their wickedness and villany... was in removing the dead from vaults in the cemetery, robbing coffins of their silver name plates and tippings, and then depositing their own dead in the vaults."[3] General John B. Hood criticized Sherman's decision to evacuate the population of Atlanta in September of 1864 by writing to Sherman that his

---

[1]John B. Walters, *Merchant of Terror: General Sherman and Total War (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1973), pp. 137-138.*

[2]*Walters, p. 200.*

[3]*As cited in Elizabeth H. McCallie, The Atlanta Campaign* (Atlanta, Ga.: The Atlanta Historical Society, 1939), p. 26.

This article has also been submitted to *Parameters*, the journal of the U. S. Army War College, for publication.

Chaplain Brinsfield is a member of the North Georgia Conference of the United Methodist Church. He is currently assigned as Assistant Professor of History and World Religions, History Department, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York. Chaplain Brinsfield received his B. D. Degree from Yale, and has a Ph. D. in Church History from Emory University.

action "transcends, in studied and ingenious cruelty, all acts ever before brought to my attention in the dark history of war."[4] General Richard Taylor, son of President Zachary Taylor, wrote in 1879 that "Sherman and Sheridan, spattered with Southern blood, were throwbacks to a barbarous age."[5] Jefferson Davis, whose *Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* provoked a newspaper debate with Sherman, wrote of the March to the Sea, "The arson of the dwelling-houses of non-combatants and the robbery of their property, extending, even to the trinkets worn by women, made the devastation as relentless as savage instincts could suggest."[6] Mrs. Davis evidently did not feel that her husband had put the matter strongly enough. She offered her own moral assessment of Sherman in the Army—Navy Journal of May 10, 1884, when she said, "He was an inhuman monster—what he did not use he destroyed."[7]

Sherman was not slow to defend himself and his army from these piecemeal attacks. Over the course of twenty years, from 1864 to 1884, Sherman wrote letters, testified in court, gave speeches, and published his *Memoirs* in an effort to set the record straight. In a letter to Captain J. H. Lee in 1881 Sherman explained his motivation:

> We must speak and write else Europe will be left to infer that we conquered not by courage, skill, and patriotic devotion, but by brute force and cruelty. The reverse was the fact, the Rebels were notoriously more cruel than our men. We never could work up our men to the terrible earnestness of the Southern forces. Their murdering of Union fugitives, burning of Lawrence, Chambersburg, Paducah and etc. were all right in their eyes, and if we burned an old cotton gin or shed it was barbarism. I am tired of such perversion and will resent it always.[8]

Sherman denied that he had ever favored wanton destruction of human life in any instance but had acted throughout his military career to punish those who did not obey the law.[9] In the course of most of his major campaigns Sherman said he preferred to conserve life and generally offered the enemy the opportunity to surrender before he set about his tasks of destruction.[10]

Sherman's problem throughout the Civil War was how to reconcile the brutal nature of modern war with the ethical values he had learned in his intermittent study of law from 1839 to 1859, as a cadet, an Army officer,

---

[4]John B. Hood, *Advance and Retreat* (New Orleans: G.T. Beauregard, 1880), p. 230.

[5]As cited in Thomas C. Leonard, *Above the Battle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 13.

[6]Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1881) II, 570.

[7]"J. Davis' Opinion" in the *Army-Navy Journal*, May 10, 1884.

[8]W.T. Sherman to Captain J.H. Lee of Spottswood, N.J., June 14, 1881. The Papers of William T. Sherman, Letterbook 95, USMA Archives Microfilm Collection. (Hereafter cited as Sherman Papers.)

[9]Robert G. Athearn, William Tecumseh Sherman and the Settlement of the West (Norman, Okla.: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1956), pp. 69-70, and Lloyd Lewis, Sherman: Fighting Prophet (NY: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1932), p. 597.

[10]Athearn, pp. 69-70 and Lloyd Lewis, Sherman: Fighting Prophet (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1932), p. 598.

and a practicing attorney. While his primary interest as a general was undeniably directed toward strategy and tactics, there was still part of his intellectual heritage from five generations of Sherman judges which demanded a correlation between the conduct of war on one hand and the laws of warfare on the other.

In the nineteenth century there were many schools of classical ethics. Francis Lieber, in his 1838 edition of *A Manual of Political Ethics*, pointed out that essentially all of the schools dealt with two concepts: morals and ethics. Moral philosophy answered the question what must I do? Ethics answered the question *why* must I do it?

Courtesy of the USMA Archives

For Sherman the most attractive ethical school was not metaphysical or theological but pragmatic and utilitarian as befitted the profession of a soldier and the avocation of a lawyer. Law was a perfect sanction for Sherman's utilitarian military ethic because the law books recognized that every punishment should be proportionate to the crime. If rebellion was the highest crime against an organized society, both utilitarian ethics and the law of nations sanctioned extreme measures, such as devastation by fire and sword, as permissible expedients.

To truly understand the ethics, that is the rationale, for Sherman's punitive expeditions in the Civil War and after, one must approach his ideas in a chronological fashion. Sherman himself noted that his military ethics before 1862 were different than they were after that year. The detailed development of Sherman's thought from his first course in moral philosophy at West Point through the end of his military career would be a lengthy task. Nevertheless a few generalized comments may shed some new light on his concept of the ethics of war and support the thesis that Sherman's philosophy of war was not totally devoid of ethical and legal principles.

Ethical Education at West Point: 1839-1840

The two courses which seem to have contributed most to Sherman's early ethical thought were both taught in his senior or "first class" year at West Point. After his summer encampment on the Plain, Sherman wrote to his brother John in August of 1839:

> The encampment is now over and we are once more in Barracks and tomorrow will commence our studies... This year's course of study is by far the most important of the four as well as the most interesting embracing as it does—Engineering—both Civil and Military—the construction of fortifications as well as the manner of attacking and defending them, Mineralology, and Geology, Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy, International and Common Law, Artillery and Infantry tactics.[11]

Sherman enjoyed his course in fortifications from Professor D.H. Mahan who was probably his favorite instructor.[12] Mahan not only taught Sherman the value of the spade but also offered his opinion that the way to defeat the Indians in Florida was to destroy their food supplies.[13]

The book which Professor Mahan frequently referenced in his course was Baron Simon Francois Gay de Vernon's *Treatise on the Science of War and Fortification* which had an appendix by Lieutenant J.M. O'Connor summarizing the thought of Jomini and Henry Lloyd on grand strategy. De Vernon's *Science of War* had been replaced as a textbook at West Point in 1836, but Sherman checked it out of the library in 1840 anyway.[14]

The interesting thing about O'Connor's translation of the *Science of War* is not only the reference to Jomini but the first chapter in which a kind of Hobbesian analysis of society is offered. "In the original state," the text read, "mankind possessed mere animal sensibility which results when a state of war between nations occurs and treaties and conventions are broken." In the condition of bestiality to which men revert in war, all civilization breaks down and even "churches may be used as redoubts."[15]

Sherman was not impressed with Jomini, whose work he said was "too dull, prosaic and didactic;" but he was drawn to Mahan and to the general notion that obedience to law was the prerequisite for avoiding the chaos of war.[16] By the end of the year 1864 Professor Mahan stated this view even more directly when he noted that "there are times in a nation's existence when the safety of the State is the highest law."[17]

The other course which made probably an even greater impact on Sherman's ethical thought was the course in Moral Philosophy taught by Chaplain Jasper Adams. Chaplain Adams was an Episcopal clergyman

---

[11]W.T. Sherman to John Sherman, 31 August 1839, Sherman Papers.

[12]William T. Sherman, *Memoirs* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957), II, 396.

[13]George P. Winton, Jr. "Ante-Bellum Military Instruction of West Point Officers and Its Influence upon Confederate Military Organization and Operations." PhD dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1972, p. 46.

[14]U.S.M.A. Library, "Entry of Books Issued to Cadets on Saturday Afternoons 1840-1843" in the U.S.M.A. Archives shows that Cadet Sherman checked out the *Science of War*, two volumes with plates, on March 2, 1840.

[15]John Michael O'Connor (trans.) *Vernon's Science of War and Fortification* (New York: J. Seymour, 1817) I, 10, 362.

[16]William C. Brown, "General Sherman and the Infantry and Cavalry School," *Journal of the United States Cavalry Association*, XVI, July 1905, p. 124.

[17]D.H. Mahan to the Hon. Gouverneur Kemble, Sept. 26, 1864, in Edward Holden's *Library Manual II*, p. 59, USMA Archives.

Courtesy of the USMA Archives

who had been successively a Professor of Mathematics at Brown University, President of Charleston College in South Carolina, and President of Geneva College in New York before coming to West Point. He was not one of Sherman's favorites on the faculty; indeed Sherman remarked that during his four years at West Point he was not "a Sunday School cadet."[18] But the subject matter covered in "the Chaplain's Course" did capture Sherman's imagination; for Adams taught rhetoric, geography, international and constitutional law, and moral philosophy in a course the cadets called simply "ethics."

Sherman was not the first cadet to be captivated by the readings in the Chaplain's Course. From 1816 when the Regulations of the U.S. Military Academy specified that "a course of ethics shall include natural and political law" to 1874 when the Law Department was formed at West Point, nine different chaplains taught law to the cadets using a series of textbooks which ranged from Vattel's *Law of Nations* (published in 1758) to Woolsey's *Introduction to the Study of International Law* (published in 1860). Robert E. Lee told Bishop Joseph Wilmer of Albemarle County, Virginia, that had he not read Rawle's *A View of the Constitution* in Chaplain Warner's course, he would never have left the Union.[19] General Erasmus D. Keyes said he "learned more from Professor Warner in the section room than from any other teacher," and Cadet Thomas J. Jackson wrote to his sister Laura in 1845 that his class in ethics was "preferable to any other in the course."[20] Walter L. Fleming, Professor of History at Louisiana State University at the turn of the century and an expert on early education at West Point, went so far as to state that the Chaplain's Course was one of the most important at the Academy in the light of the subsequent history of the Civil War.[21] In fact, one could make a pretty good case for the thesis that the textbooks in the Chaplain's course contained many of the operative strategic and ethical concepts of the Civil War and that

---

[18]Lewis, p. 56.

[19]As cited in Wilbur Thomas, *General George H. Thomas* (New York: Exposition Press, 1964), p. 63. See also Douglas S. Freeman, *R.E. Lee: A Biography* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1934), I, 78-79.

[20]E.D. Keyes, *Fifty Years Observation of Men and Events (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1884), p. 77, and Thomas Jackson Arnold, Early Life and Letters of Stonewall Jackson* (Richmond, Va.: Dietz Press, 1957), p. 73.

[21]Walter L. Fleming, "Jefferson Davis at West Point," *Metropolitan Magazine*, 1908, p. 282.

these concepts, including retaliation, blockades, emancipation, and unconditional surrender, were discussed at West Point over twenty years before the first shot was ever fired at Fort Sumter.

The reason so many cadets were interested in "the Chaplain's Course," as it was entitled by the U.S.M.A. Regulations of 1839, was that it combined the study of humanities and law which were offered nowhere else in the curriculum. In Sherman's first class year Chaplain Adams taught Moral Philosophy, the Law of Nations, and Constitutional Law in that order.[22]

In his course Adams heard cadet recitations for two hours a day from William Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy* and from James Kent's *Commentaries on American Law*. A mastery of these textbooks was essential for the cadets, as Adams informed Superintendent Richard Delafield in February, 1840:

> An exact knowledge of these textbooks is held to be of the greatest importance, long and patient examinations are held upon them, and the relative standing of the Cadets in the Academy is made to depend on their acquaintance with them. Not only so, but their future rank in the army, and consequently their prospects in life, are made to depend on the degree of their acquaintance with them. The plan of instruction by lectures is not approved in the Academy...[23]

Adams did not approve of Paley's book because it taught "the young men that they have no conscience, diminishes their respect for truth, and perplexes, if it does not confound the distinction between right and wrong."[24] Adams' petition to replace Paley's text was denied by the Academic Board, however, in part because he had already changed textbooks three times in two years and been warned by Joel R. Poinsett, President Van Buren's Secretary of War, "to be more careful."[25]

The content of Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy* is fascinating and worth a dissertation in itself because it was the textbook used by Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, A.S. Johnston, J.E. Johnston, P.G.T. Beauregard, W.T. Sherman, and Ulysses Grant. Paley's work is a combination of advice for daily living coupled with some reflections on the origin of government, on crime and punishment, on duty, and on the justice of warfare.

In essence Paley took a utilitarian approach to life, for "the obligation of every law depends upon its ultimate utility."[26] Rules "derive their force not from their internal reasonableness or justice but from their

---

[22]U.S.M.A. Academic Board Minutes, November 5, 1838, USMA Archives.

[23]Prof. Jasper Adams to Major R. Delafield, 3 February 1840 in the Jasper Adams Papers, USMA Archives, Drawer F.

[24]*Ibid.*

[25]U.S.M.A. Academic Board Minutes, October 28, 1839 and November 15, 1839, USMA Archives.

[26]William Paley, *The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (Boston: West and Richardson, 1815) p. 463.

establishment."[27] God is the ultimate lawmaker, "A Being whose knowledge penetrates every concealment, from the operation of whose will not art or flight can escape, and in whose hands punishment is sure; such a Being may conduct the moral government of his creation in the best and wisest manner by pronouncing a law that every crime shall finally receive a punishment proportioned to the guilt which it contains, abstracted from any foreign consideration whatever; by carrying this law into strict execution."[28] It is God's will that all men should be happy and happiness is generally the greatest good for the greatest number.[29] Therefore one asks about any moral question, "Does it promote or diminish the general happiness?" If an action promotes happiness, it is the Will of God.[30]

In spite of the utilitarian nature of Paley's work, James Kent's *Commentaries on American Law* was Sherman's favorite textbook in the Chaplain's Course. James Kent was in 1829 a professor of law at Columbia, the President of the New York Historical Society, and Colonel Sylvanus Thayer's personal friend. Because Kent's book covered both the Law of Nations and Constitutional Law in one summary volume, and was thus more easily taught, it replaced Vattel's and Rawle's works which had been used intermittently from 1820 to 1832.

Kent believed in a pessimistic realism about human nature and about the practice of warfare. For example, Kent begins his Third Lecture, "Of the Declaration and other early measures of a state of war," by contrasting Bacon's statement that "War is one of the highest trials of right... put upon the justice of God by an appeal to arms," with Hobbes' view that "Continual war is a natural instinct of man in a savage state."[31] Kent believed that man, without the social compact, reverted to a primitive level. War was "a dissolution of all moralities" and was fought between "all the individuals of the one, and all the individuals of which the other nation is composed."[32] Retaliation was allowed in such a total war to restrain the enemy from further excess.[33]

One of the best protective measures against such chaos was a strong central government. Kent observed that "The history of the federal governments of Greece, Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, afford melancholy examples of destructive civil war springing from the disobedience of the separate members."[34] Therefore Kent believed that "Disobedience to the laws of the union must either be submitted to by the government to its own disgrace or those laws must be enforced by arms."[35]

---

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 465.
[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 386-387.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 64.
[30] *Ibid.*
[31] James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law* (New York: O. Halsted, 1826), I, p. 45.
[32] *Ibid.*, I, 53.
[33] *Ibid.*, I, 89.
[34] *Ibid.*, I, 199.
[35] *Ibid.*

Coupled with Kent's "total" war theory and his unionist sentiments was his strong aversion to slavery. Kent's solution to the slavery problem was not Christian persuasion as Paley had suggested, but violent, though legal, confrontation. Kent noted bluntly, "Pirates can be exterminated without declaration of war and the African slave trade is declared to be piracy by the statute laws of England and the United States."[36]

Sherman's class was examined in moral philosophy and in their other subjects in January of 1840. Examinations typically lasted for seventeen days, from eight o'clock in the morning to dusk; each cadet was examined orally in turn by the entire faculty and sometimes by members of the Board of Visitors.[37] Cadet Sherman wrote that "the results were favorable toward me as usual."[38] He placed sixth in his class in moral philosophy, better than Cadets Grant, Stuart, and Davis but not as well as Lee or Jackson.[39] Had it not been for Sherman's average of 150 demerits a year for problems in conduct he would have graduated fourth rather than sixth in his class.

The academic curriculum was not the only place military ethics and discipline were emphasized, of course. The Code of Honor, compulsory attendance at Chapel. and the U.S.M.A. Regulations of 1839 all supplemented and reinforced ethical awareness. Article I, paragraph 52 of the Articles of War, which were appended to the U.S.M.A. Regulations caught Sherman's eye. That paragraph made it a capital offense for a soldier to quit his post in order to plunder or pillage. After 1862 Sherman said he ignored this "old" idea.[40]

From Florida to Tennessee: The Transformation

From the time that Lt. Sherman joined the 3d Artillery Regiment in September of 1840 until the Civil War began, he really never saw a battlefield. He was one of the few major commanders in the Civil War who had no combat experience in the Mexican War. His letters to his brothers and sisters from Fort Pierce, Florida in 1841 show a relatively conservative view of military ethics. He discussed the treaties broken by the Indians and the suffering of their women and children which they bore "with fortitude."[41] In his single engagement against the Seminoles, Sherman rode alone into an Indian village after instructing his troops to "revenge" him if he were killed. He literally talked the Indians out of their weapons and

---

[36]*Ibid.*, I, 179.

[37]Prof. J. Adams to Major R. Delafield, 3 February 1840, in the Jasper Adams Papers, USMA Archives, Drawer F.

[38]W.T. Sherman to John Sherman, 14 January 1840, Sherman Papers.

[39]Lee placed second in "Natural and National Law and Ethics" in 1829, Jackson was fifth in 1846. Grant was below average in ethics, and Sheridan had to spend a fifth year at West Point because of problems in conduct. It is interesting to note that Sherman, Grant, and Sheridan all graduated from West Point as cadet privates due to excess demerits.

[40]Lewis, p. 442.

[41]W.T. Sherman to "My dear Sister," January 16, 1841, Sherman Papers.

marched them back to Fort Pierce.[42] It was a pattern of bloodless victory which Sherman would try again at Atlanta in 1864 and at Fort Laramie in 1867 but with less success.

Sherman did devote himself to the casual study of law during his Army assignments in Florida and in South Carolina. It was perhaps natural that Sherman should have considered law as a possible second profession as did T.J. Jackson and J.E.B. Stuart. Yet Sherman practiced law for only one year at Leavenworth, Kansas, before the Civil War began. He wrote to his brother John that although "everybody" in his class studied law at West Point, he did not feel he was enough of an orator to make it his profession.[43] He preferred the thought of retiring to a good farm in Iowa.

Sherman's career from his Army resignation in 1853 to the beginning of the Civil War evidently had a lot to do with his general outlook on life, but an analysis of his psychological development in the face of his banking and business failures exceeds the scope of this present discussion. Certainly Sherman's decision to abandon his post as Superintendent of the Louisiana State Seminary and Military Academy in order to stay in the Union "as long as a fragment" of the "Old Constitution" survived was a monumental decision for him.[44] The critical turning point in Sherman's concept of strictly military ethics, nevertheless, came between his service in Virginia in 1861 and his service in Tennessee in 1862.

Sherman's attitude toward pillage and destruction in 1861 was exemplified in a letter to his wife after the Battle of Bull Run:

> Then for the first time I saw the carnage of battle, men lying in every conceivable shape and mangled in a horrid way.... No curse could be greater than invasion by a volunteer army. No Goths or Vandals ever had less respect for the lives and property of friend and foes....[45]

Sherman's comments were not directed just at any volunteer army but at his own in particular. In a letter to his wife, Ellen, Sherman wrote in August of 1861:

> ...our soldiers are the most destructive men that I have ever known. It may be that other volunteers are just as bad, indeed the complaint is universal, and I see no alternative but to let it take its course.... My only hope now is that a common sense of decency may be inspired into the minds of this soldiery to respect life and property.[46]

Even though Sherman had given up making "any friends in Virginia," he did try to maintain some discipline among his troops who were "straggling for water, blackberries, or any thing on the way they fancied."[47]

---

[42]Lewis, p. 68.

[43]W.T. Sherman to John Sherman, 7 March 1840, Sherman Papers.

[44]Photographs of Sherman's letter of resignation dated 18 January 1861 are in the USMA Library.

[45]Walters, pp. 20-21.

[46]*Ibid*, p. 22.

[47]*Ibid*., p. 21 and W.T. Sherman, Memoirs, II, 181.

Sherman's determination to keep his troops in line was further exemplified during his service in Kentucky in the winter of 1861-1862. He issued strict orders preventing his troops from taking any fresh food on the march, from sleeping in any vacant houses, and even from using Kentucky fence rails for firewood.[48] As a result one regiment under his command, the 33rd Indiana, had over fifty percent of its men in the hospital and suffered sixty-two deaths from exposure and from insufficient rations in one month. When two citizens of Lexington, Kentucky, asked Sherman in October of 1861 if he would arrest Southern sympathizers as a "retaliatory" measure, Sherman replied that he would arrest no one merely for holding an opinion as long as they committed no overt criminal act.[49]

In carrying out these restrictions Sherman was obeying the orders of the War Department for operations in Border States. In spite of the fact that Jefferson Davis had written a personal letter to President Abraham Lincoln on July 6, 1861, threatening random retaliatory executions of Union prisoners in Richmond if Confederate sailors captured by the Federal navy were hanged as pirates, the War Department, through General Henry Halleck, held to a very strict policy respecting the sanctity of private property and individual constitutional rights until mid-1862.[50] Sherman soon discovered, however, that the enemy did not operate under such constraints:

> ...when I would not let our men burn fence rails for fire or gather fruit or vegetables though hungry... We at that time were restrained, tied by a deep-seated reverence for law and property. The rebels first introduced terror as a part of their system... Buell had to move at a snail's pace with his vast wagon trains... Bragg moved rapidly, living on the country. No military mind could endure this long, and we were forced in self-defense to imitate their example.[51]

The genesis of Sherman's conversion from a proponent of warfare by the rules of courtesy to warfare by the rules of survival, therefore, was not a result of a deliberate policy created from intellectual theory. It was a reaction in self-defense to the conditions Sherman encountered in the field. Twenty years after the Civil War Sherman reflected on his shift in thinking:

> I know that in the beginning, I, too, had the old West Point notion that pillage was a capital crime, and punished it by shooting... This was a one-sided game of war, and many of us... ceased to quarrel with our own men about such minor things, and went in to subdue the enemy, leaving minor depredations to be charged up to the account of the rebels who had forced us into the war, and who deserved all they got and more.[52]

---

[48] Lewis, p. 188.

[49] *The War of Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union an Confederate Armies* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1887), Series 2, vol. 2, p. 814. (Hereafter cited as O. Records).

[50] Jefferson Davis, *Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*, II, 11; *Official Records*, Series 1, vol. 17, part 2, pp. 16-17.

[51] W.T. Sherman to James Guthrie, 14 August 1864 as cited in Lewis, p. 398.

[52] *Lewis*, p. 442.

From his observations in 1862 in Kentucky and in Tennessee, it was a short step for Sherman to synthesize concepts which paralleled the darker side of the West Point curriculum he had studied, concepts such as retaliation, punishment, revenge, and devastation.

Sherman was not alone in these observations, of course. Colonel Ulysses S. Grant wrote in 1861 independently of Sherman that while his men of the 21st Illinois marched from Camp Yates to Missouri "the same number of men never marched through a thickly settled country like this committing fewer depredations."[53] Yet Grant warned his wife Julia that "The people are inclined to carry on a guerilla warfare that must eventuate in retaliation, and when it does commence it will be hard to control."[54]

By the summer of 1862 the U.S. Congress and the Lincoln Administration too had become convinced that more stringent measures were necessary to subdue the rebels who had fought so fiercely in the Peninsula Campaign and at Shiloh. On the thirteenth of July Brigadier General Steinwehr ordered Major William Steadman to arrest five citizens of Page County, Virginia, to be held as hostages and to suffer death in the event any of Steinwehr's troops were killed by "bushwhackers."[55] On the seventeenth of July the 37th Congress passed the famous Seizure Act which provided for the confiscation and/or condemnation of all personal property belonging to persons engaged in rebellion.[56]

The Confederate Government responded in kind by issuing General Order Number 54 on August 1, 1862, indicating the adoption of "just measures of retribution and retaliation as shall seem adequate to repress and punish these barbarities." Among other measures ordered by General Samuel Cooper, the Confederate States Inspector General, was the warning that the Confederate government would hang Union officers, then prisoners of war, in "a number equal to the number of our own citizens thus murdered by the enemy.[57]

In retaliation for ever increasing guerrilla activities in Mississippi and the number of "murders" committed by Southern "irregulars", in turn, Union General Henry Halleck ordered General Grant at Corinth, Mississippi, on August 2, 1862, to:

> ...clean out West Tennessee and North Mississippi of all organized enemies. If necessary, take up all active sympathizers, and either hold them as prisoners or put them beyond our lines. Handle that class without gloves, and take their property for public use. As soon as the corn gets fit for forage get all the supplies you can from the rebels in Mississippi. It is time that they should begin to feel the presence of war on our side.[58]

---

[53]William S. McFeely, *Grant*, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1981), p. 81.

[54]*Ibid.*, p. 78.

[55]Thomas Jordan, *General Orders from Adjutant and Inspector General's Office, C.S. Army in 1862* (Charleston, S.C.: Evans and Cogswell, 1863), p. 66.

[56]John F. Callan, *The Military Laws of the United States* (Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1863), p. 521.

[57]Jordan, p. 68.

[58]*O. Records*, Series 1, vol. 17, part 2, p. 150.

Within four days of the receipt of this order, General W.L. Elliott, Rosecrans' Chief of Staff at Corinth, ordered General James D. Morgan at Tuscumbia to move rebel women and children beyond his lines, seize their property, and burn their homes.[59]

At Memphis Sherman reflected on this development in a letter to Secretary Chase dated August 11, 1862, in words reminiscent of Kent's total war theory:

> The Government of the United States may now safely proceed on the proper rule that all in the South are enemies of all in the North; and not only are they unfriendly, but all who can procure arms now bear them as organized regiments or as guerillas. There is not a garrison in Tennessee where a man can go beyond the sight of the flagstaff without being shot or captured.[60]

Grant, in turn, reflected later that the "Constitution was therefore in abeyance for the time being, so far as it in any way affected the progress and termination of the war."[61]

With Constitutional interpretation replaced by Congressional law and the principle of military necessity, Sherman was free to suppress rebellion with almost any amount of force necessary. On October 1, 1862 he wrote to his brother John:

> Even on the Mississippi the boats are fired on daily. I have been compelled to burn down one town and resort to retaliation. For after eighteen months of war the enemy is actually united, armed, and determined... the northern people have to unlearn all their experience of the past thirty years and be born again before they will see the truth.[62]

The truth, for Sherman, was that by arming all of its citizens, the South, not the North had plunged the nation into total war. If the Union was to survive, the people of the North would have to adjust themselves to fight on the terms which the South, Sherman charged, had dictated.

On October 4, 1862, Sherman exemplified this belief in a letter from Memphis to Major General U.S. Grant at Jackson, Tennessee. Sherman told Grant that

> Guerrillas have twice attacked boats near Randolph—the forest Queen and J.J. Roe—on both of which were many lady and children passengers. The attacks were wanton and cruel. I caused Randolph to be destroyed, and have given public notice that a repetition will justify any measures of retaliation such as loading the boats with their captive guerrillas as targets (I always have a lot on hand), and expelling families from the comforts of Memphis, whose husbands and brothers go to make up those guerrillas.[63]

Evidently this "new" turn of events in Memphis, and in his command for that matter, took Grant by surprise. On the 18th of October, when Sher-

---

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 154-155.

[60] Walters, pp. 57-58.

[61] U.S. Grant, *Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant* (London: Sampson Law, Marston, Searle and Rivington, 1886), II, 507.

[62] W.T. Sherman to John Sherman, Oct 1, 1862 in the USMA Library, LAC 11541, p. 166.

[63] *O. Records*, Series I, vol. 17, part 2, pp. 261-2.

man proposed to "expel ten secession families for every boat fired on." thereby visiting "on the neighborhood summary punishment," Grant sent a one-sentence indorsement to General Halleck:

> Respectfully forwarded to Headquarters of the Army for information of the General-in-Chief, embodying as it does a policy, which I approve but have given no order for, in regard to treatment of rebel families as punishment to prevent firing into boats.[64]

Five days after Grant sent his indorsement to Halleck, Colonel William S. Hillyer, Grant's Aide-de-Camp wrote Sherman, "The general heartily approves your course in expelling secession families as a punishment and preventive example for guerrillas firing into boats."[65] For the first time in the Civil War Sherman had a Commander who understood the concept of retaliation to restrain the enemy, who had witnessed the effects of total war in Texas, and who, for that matter, was also once a student of the same West Point curriculum.

From Atlanta to the Sea: The Application

That Sherman, Grant, and Sheridan translated the will of Congress and the ideas of President Lincoln into a war of devastation aimed at total victory is not a fact requiring detailed proof. Sherman himself estimated his March the Sea cost the State of Georgia 15,000 first-rate mules, 5,000 head of cattle, and 2,000 horses in addition to 34,979 Confederate casualties.[66] The question is not, however. what homes, towns, railroads, colleges, churches, or government buildings were destroyed. After all, Grant had instructed Sherman to "get into the interior of the enemy's country as far as you can, inflicting all the damage you can against their war resources."[67] The question is to what extent Sherman left the "old West Point" ideas behind in his quest for victory.

Sherman maintained in 1864 that he tried on many occasions to persuade his enemies to surrender and thereby to end the destruction his army caused in the South:

> I contended at first, when we took Vicksburg, by all the rules of civilized warfare, they should have surrendered, and allowed us to restore Federal power in the land. But they did not. I claim also when we took Atlanta, that they were bound by every rule of civilized warfare to surrender their cause....[68]

During the Georgia and Carolina campaigns Sherman certainly used his authority under the law of nations, Congressional law, Army Regulations, and the directives of Grant and Lincoln to offer generous terms of sur-

---

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 307.

[66] W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, II, 208, 132.

[67] As cited in Archer Jones, "Jomini and the Strategy of the American Civil War, A Reinterpretation," *Military Affairs*, December, 1970, p. 130.

[68] Lewis, p. 424.

render which were not only in accord with the precepts of Vattel but also in the finest Napoleonic tradition.[69] Yet when he offered to Governor Brown of Georgia to "spare the State, and in our passage across it confine the troops to the main roads and... moreover, pay for all the corn and food we needed," the Georgia Legislature under the leadership of Robert Toombs rejected Sherman's proposal, called for a levy en masse of all white males aged 16 to 45, released the prisoners from the State Penitentiary, and even pressed all ministers not actively serving a church or synagogue into the Confederate forces.[70] In the light of this response, Sherman told Colonel Joshua Hill, one of the emissaries to Governor Brown, "There is nothing left for me to do but to proceed."[71]

Of the conduct of his troops during the March to the Sea, Sherman wrote in 1875:

> No doubt many acts of pillage, robbery, and violence were committed by these parties of foragers, usually called "bummers' for I have since heard of jewelry taken from women, and the plunder of articles that never reached the commissary; but these acts were exceptional and incidental. I never heard of any cases of murder or rape; and no army could have carried along sufficient forage for a march of three hundred miles; so that foraging in some shape was necessary.[72]

When Sherman arrived in Savannah he placed the city, its schools and churches, under his protection with the warning, "if any person shall abuse these privileges by communicating with the enemy, or doing any act of hostility to the Government of the United States, he or she will be punished with the utmost rigor of the law."[73] Sherman claimed that the disposal of property in and around Savannah was in accord with the "laws of nations and the practice of civilized governments."[74]

Sherman's campaign in the Carolinas was marked with charges of pillage and arson just as had been the case in Georgia. The ethical maxim he had recommended to his commanders on the March to the Sea was a principle of retaliation by degree and it was continued, in effect, throughout his military career:

> In districts and neighborhoods where the army is unmolested, no destruction of (private) property should be permitted; but should guerrillas or bush wackers molest our march, or should the inhabitants burn bridges, obstruct roads, or otherwise manifest local hostility, then army commanders should order and enforce a devastation more or less relentless, according to the measure of such hostility.[75]

---

[69] Vattel held that "the right to make war ceases upon the offer of just terms," Charles G. Fenwick (ed.), *The Law of Nations*, (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institute, 1916), p. 254.

[70] W.T. Sherman, Memoirs, II, 138 and Lt. Col. Charles C. Jones, *The Siege of Savannah* (Albany, N.Y.: Joel Munsell, 1874), p. 13.

[71] Lewis, p. 423.

[72] W.T. Sherman, Memoirs, II, 182-183.

[73] *Ibid.*, II, 233.

[74] *Ibid.*, II, 267.

[75] W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, II, 175.

Sherman kept the responsibility for damages squarely on the shoulders of the Southern leadership. If they cooperated with him, he could be generous; if they opposed him, he was unrelenting in punishment.

Sherman's conduct in allegedly burning Columbia, South Carolina, out of sheer malice and revenge for South Carolina's part in starting the Civil War seemed to his generation to mark the apogee of his cruelty. Yet Sherman told the veterans of the Army of the Potomac in 1881:

> I saw with my own eyes cotton bales which had been set on fire by the Confederate cavalry. Without Logan's troops not a house would have escaped.[76]

If there were a few troops who got out of hand it was because they found whiskey in the town the Confederates had made a liquor depot, Sherman claimed. Furthermore, the fire spread because "God Almighty started the wind that carried it."[77] "If I had made up my mind to burn Columbia, I would have burnt it with no more feeling than I would a common prairie dog village," Sherman testified, "but I did not do it."[78]

Sherman noted in 1881 that after 329 pages of testimony in 23 legal cases brought against him, an international commission of judges disallowed the claim the "Columbia was wantonly fired by General Sherman."[79] What he did at Columbia, as reflected partly in his pocket diary, was to deliberately destroy only the public buildings. Then he left behind five hundred beef cattle and one hundred muskets for the citizens "to arm a guard to maintain order after we should leave the neighborhood."[80] For Sherman consistently maintained "that, personally. I had no malice or desire to destroy that city or its inhabitants."[81]

The proof of such personal intent to avoid wanton injury in the Carolinas is in Sherman's continuing offer of peaceful terms to his enemies. In public and largely for propaganda purposes, Sherman would threaten to turn his army loose since the soldiers were "burning to avenge the national wrong which they attach to large cities which have been so prominent in dragging our country into civil war."[82] Thus he emphasized on one occasion that he would make North Carolina "howl"; but he also told his cavalry commander, General Kilpatrick, to is deal "as moderately and fairly by North Carolinians as possible, and fan the flame of discord already subsisting between them and their proud cousins of South Carolina."[83] Finally, to General Joseph E. Johnston, Sherman wrote on April 14, 1865:

---

[76]W.T. Sherman, "Address to the Army of the Potomac," Army-Navy Journal, June 11, 1881, p. 945.

[77]Lewis, pp. 506-507.

[78]*Ibid.*, p. 508.

[79]W.T. Sherman, "Address to the Army of the Potomac," p. 945.

[80]W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, II, 287.

[81]*Ibid.*, II, 286.

[82]*Ibid.*, II, 211.

[83]Lewis, pp. 509, 514.

> I am fully empowered to arrange with you any terms for the suspension of further hostilities between the armies commanded by you and those commanded by myself.... General Stoneman is under my command, and my order will suspend any devastation or destruction contemplated by him. I will add that I really desire to save the people of North Carolina the damage they would sustain by the march of this army through the central or western parts of the State.[84]

Sherman's comment to Johnston is not at variance with his famous letter of 12 September 1864 to James M. Calhoun, the Mayor of Atlanta, wherein Sherman promised, "...when peace does come, you may call on me for any thing. Then will I share with you the last cracker, and watch with you to shield your homes and families against danger from every quarter."[85]

An Integrated Theory

With the surrender of Johnston's Army in North Carolina under terms other than those which he had generously proposed, General Sherman's combat experience came to an end.[86] He had evolved an ethical theory of warfare, however, which would influence the conduct of the Indian Wars in the West for the next twenty years.

Sherman felt that society without law was chaotic. In 1860 he wrote, perhaps reflecting some of the old West Point ideas he had studied twenty years before:

> The law is or should be our king; we should obey it, not because it meets our approval but because it is the law and because obedience in some shape is necessary to every system of civilized government. For years this tendency to anarchy had gone on till now every state and county and town... makes and enforces the local prejudices as the law of the land. This is the real trouble, it is not slavery, it is the democratic spirit which substitutes mere opinions for law.[87]

The South violated the law first, Sherman believed, when they willingly went into the 1860 election" and because that election did not result as they wanted, they refused to abide by the result and appealed to war."[88] That decision, according to Sherman, was folly, madness, treason, and "a crime against civilization."[89] It left the South free to treat with foreign powers against the interests of the United States as a whole.

---

[84]W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, II, 347.

[85]*Ibid.*, II, 127.

[86]Sherman proposed that the Confederate armies should deposit their arms in their own state arsenals, that the officers and legislatures of the several states be recognized by the Executive of the United States upon taking an oath to support the Constitution, and that the people be guaranteed their political rights and franchises under a general amnesty. Sherman saw these terms as effecting the will of Abraham Lincoln. The assassination of Lincoln led to their disapproval by President Johnson and Secretary Stanton. See Philemon Tecumseh Sherman, "Address to the Society of the Army of the Tennessee," p. 20 in the USMA Archives.

[87]Lewis, p. 134.

[88]Lewis, p. 332.

[89]Lewis, pp. 138, and W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, II, 167, 152.

Sherman came to believe that the Civil War the South was waging was a rebellion; and therefore, under Vattel's old definition, the unjust and lawless rebels were subject to severe punishment.[90] Sherman's theory of punishment leaned heavily on the ideas of collective responsibility and retaliation to prevent further cruelty by the enemy.[91] He wrote, for example, to General Edward R.S. Canby to hold Southern civilians accountable for guerrilla outrages, "for if they fire on boats with women and children in (them), we can fire and burn houses with women and children."[92] This was possible, of course, because warfare was waged between "all the individuals" on one side and "all the individuals" on the other. Eventually the enemy would tire and peace would return.

Sherman realized that war was not an end in itself, but a means to an end. "The legitimate object of war is a more perfect peace" under the authority of a lawful, democratic government.[93] Toward that end Sherman saw warfare waged on a psychological as well as a military level. Thus many of Sherman's public statements during the Georgia Campaign were designed to make the enemy "fear and dread us" and may have accounted for the fact that Sherman's armies suffered fewer campaign casualties in 1864 than his Confederate opponents.[94] General Grant, as a matter of fact, characterized Sherman's occupation of Atlanta as a "political campaign."[95]

On another level, however, Sherman saw war in somewhat metaphysical terms. He told the graduating class at West Point in 1876 that "wars are only the means to an end—not necessarily inhuman, barbarous, abhorred by God." As a matter of fact "war is of divine origin," like lightning which strikes the just and the unjust alike.[96] "We were born in war, baptized in war, and we have had wars of aggression and defence," Sherman told the cadets, but there is still "a Divinity that shapes our ends."

How could war be of divine origin? Sherman wrote to Major Henry Turner two years after his West Point address:

> I believe God governs this world, with all its life, animal, vegetable and human, by invariable laws, resulting in the greatest good, though sometimes working seeming hardships. The idea of a vocation from God seems to me irreligious and I would look for the inspiration of a vocation in the opposite quarter (the Devil). When anybody assumes "vocation" their reason and all

---

[90]Philemon T. Sherman, "Address," p. 18.

[91]W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, II, 279-260; Athearn, pp. 69-70, 131, 279; Lewis, Pp. 597-599.

[92]Lewis, p. 332.

[93]W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, xii. The quotation is the inscription on Sherman's statue in Washington. See also Gen. W.T. Sherman, *Address to the Graduating Class of the U.S. Military Academy, June 14, 1876* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1876) p. 26.

[94]As cited in Archer Jones, "Jomini and the Strategy of the American Civil War," p. 130. See also Timothy H. Donovan, Roy K. Flint, Arthur V. Grant, Jr., and Gerald P. Stadler, *The American Civil War* (West Point, NY: Department of History, U.S.M.A.: 1980), p. 325.

[95]McFeely, p. 188.

[96]W.T. Sherman, *Address to the Graduating Class, June 14, 1876*, p. 29, and W.T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, II, 126.

sense ceases and man becomes simply a blind animal. My idea of God is that he has given man reason, and he has no right to disregard it.[97]

Presumably the abandonment of reason brought on war, which was its own punishment in Sherman's view. Since punishment for the crime of unrestrained passion is part of the invariable law of God, war is punishment of divine origin which affects both the guilty and the innocent. The best one could do in such circumstances was to end the war as quickly and as justly as possible.

Sherman, in his Civil War years, did not abandon his attachment to the law or to some of the ethical concepts he may have learned at West Point. Rather, he placed the laws of warfare on a continuum of expediency. The important thing was not the means but the end, and to this point Sherman was clearly a utilitarian thinker. What the South learned to fear was not Sherman's aggression nor his lack of mercy when circumstances allowed. What was fearful was his revenge.

Yet Sherman's job was not to philosophize about, but to destroy the roots of serious rebellions, Southern and Indian, and he spent his entire military career to that end. His doctrines of collective responsibility and retaliation were rationalizations for ending a destructive war. They should be fully understandable rationalizations to those who are heirs not only of Atlanta and Columbia, but also of Dresden, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki.

In the last analysis Sherman may have contributed something relatively important in the field of military ethics. Even though he wept at the advent of the Civil War, Sherman soon realized that the popular theory of chivalrous conduct in war was itself a throwback to an earlier age.[98] "Its glory is all moonshine," he told a Michigan audience. "It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded who cry aloud for blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell."[99] Yet even in hell Sherman tried to show that, when circumstances allowed, there should be a regard if not for chivalry at least for the laws of nations. He was not the author either of the theory or the ethics of total war, but he may have been the leading intellectual apologist for those ideas in his generation. To that extent he was not a total warrior completely devoid of principle.

---

[97]As cited in Joseph T. Durkin, S.J., *General Sherman's Son* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1959), p. 53.

[98]Lewis, p. 138.

[99]W.T. Sherman, "An Address Before the Graduating Class of the Michigan Military Academy, June 19, 1879," in Christopher Morlzy (ed) *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations*, (New York: Little, Brown, and Co., 1957), p. 366.

Educational Strategies for Moral Development

Chaplain (LTC) Donald W. Gover

"Moral education must keep pace with technological progress; our greatest need is to be, not simply to do or to have."

—H. L. Mounce

Introduction

In the past few years there has been a dramatic increase of concern centering around ethical behavior. Articles on ethics or values are popular fare in military and other professional journals. Books on related subjects are being published at an unprecedented rate and educational institutions are busy developing courses of instruction in ethical decision-making. Viewpoints in the market place range in their diversity from Jesus to Machiavelli and back again. In short, organizational and personal ethics are topical issues and a national dialogue on ethics has begun.[1]

This intense interest is welcome. Some have questioned the direction the debate is taking.[2] Others see ethical studies as merely a "faddish" response to our recent national experiences highlighted by Watergate and ABSCAM. The pessimist might claim that as soon as another, and more attractive, fad is born, ethics as an item of concern will go the way of the dodo. The optimist, on the other hand, could hope that the interest is real and permanent, and that institutionalization of such courses of study will insure remaining interest.

The critical issue is whether instruction in ethical concerns can be effective, and if so, what form these educational experiences are to take? In this essay I will propose an approach to moral education that centers on:

[1]Donna G. Ayres, and Stephen D. Clement, *A Leadership Model for Organizational Ethics* (Indianapolis: US Army Administration Center—Leadership Series Monograph No. 13, 1978), p. 1.

[2]Herman Keizer, Jr., Published Television Editorial, TRADOC Chaplain's Bulletin 78-10, Incl 2, October, 1978.

Chaplain Gover, a Southern Baptist, is a training developer at the US Army Chaplain Center and School. He holds graduate degrees in theology and education and is currently a doctoral candidate in education at the College of William and Mary.

(1) problem-oriented scenarios that encourage careful moral reasoning, and (2) a philosophically oriented process of moral development that is prescriptive toward principled reasoning. It is not the intent of this essay to develop the literature centering on Biblical or theological ethics. It should be noted, however, that cognitive moral development has explicit implications for religious faith development.[3]

First, I think it would be advantageous to review the two most persistent approaches to moral education—indoctrination and values clarification.

Indoctrination as Moral Education

Indoctrination has a long history in the field of moral education. American education—as a direct reflection of its foundations in religious ideology—has its roots in this approach to the teaching of moral values. Peter Scharf states:

> Moral indoctrination is one response to the moral malaise of contemporary society. Its underlying philosophy appears simple, but it should not be either accepted or rejected out of hand. Moral indoctrination defines specific values as "right" for a particular society or group. It holds that moral values may be taught directly....[4]

Examples of methodologies used to inculcate values by indoctrination are familiar to most of us. From a recitation of the Ten Commandants in a church-school class to moral lessons in the McGuffey Reader, our National experience testifies that the primary method of moral instruction has been indoctrination. Learning takes places through repetition, association, modeling and reward. Indeed, while intended to be highly principled, in many instances. problems remain. What is "right" (or "wrong") in most instances, remains bound to societal, cultural, or professional norms. Though not intended, the values of a specific generation become time-bound. Generational relativitism is a natural by-product.

Many examples of this type of moral education are still prevalent. Honor codes, regulations concerning ethical (or unethical) actions and practices. instruction that defines proper behavior and appeals for compliance—all are grounded in an indoctrinational approach. The question that arises is not one of appropriateness but one of effectiveness... not that codes are redundant but what else is needed. Indoctrination plays an important part in defining cultural or professional standards but can the shibboleth "go forth and do right" suffice? While superb as an educational methodology for certain levels and ages, the concept of indoctrination presents certain problems. In noting that "indoctrination implies a pejorative judgement on a teaching situation," I.A. Snook suggests that indoctri-

---

[3]See James Fowler, "Stages in Faith," in *Values* and *Moral Development*. Ed. T. Hennessey (New York: Paulist Press, 1976).

[4]Peter Scharf, "New Trends in Moral Education," *The Church School*, November 1979, p. 4.

nation occurs only when a proposition or set of propositions are taught "with the intention that the pupil believes [them] regardless of the evidence."[5] Motivation is central to an understanding of the appropriateness of indoctrination as a vehicle for the transmittal of values.

Value Clarification as Moral Education

For more than a decade the values clarification movement has consistently adhered to a philosophy that cultural values should not be taught. Louis Raths, Sidney Simon, Leland Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum are influential figures in the movement. Unlike indoctrination, values clairification is not concerned with the content of people's values, but with the process of valuing. "The focus is on how people come to hold certain beliefs and establish certain behavior patterns."[6]

Instead of indoctrination, values clarification promotes an educational model that is open-ended. The primary task is seen as having students explore value problems in order to raise one's consciousness relative to value laden issues. This is accomplished by:

CHOOSING: (1) freely
(2) from alternatives
(3) after thoughtful consideration of the consequences
PRIZING: (4) cherishing, being happy with the choice
(5) willing to affirm the choice publicly
ACTING: (6) doing something with the choice
(7) repeatedly, in some pattern of life

"These processes collectively define valuing. Results of the valuing process are called values."[7]

What is "right" in value clarification is determined by the individual through reflection on alternative value premises. Learning takes place through self-analysis and awareness of implications of value choices. Raths, Harmin, and Simon go on to explain that "clarifying responses operate in situations in which there are no 'right' answers, such as in situations involving feelings, attitudes, beliefs, or purposes. They are not appropriate for drawing a student toward a predetermined answer."[8]

Values clarification is predicated largely on the assumption that the moral norms of our society have become so pluralistic as to force individuals to define their own value commitments. Such a position is a difficult one with which to argue... but some have severe reservations regarding the relativistic nature of the movement. Delattre and Bennett list several caveats when they state:

---

[5]I.A. Snook, *Indoctrination and Education* (London: Routledge and Keganpaul, 1972) p. 47.

[6]Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, *Values Clarification* (New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc., 1972) p. 19.

[7]Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, *Values and Teaching* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966) p. 30.

[8]*Ibid.*, p. 54.

> Certainly, it is hard to argue against moral growth informed by critical self-examination, nor are the criticisms which follow intended toward that end. At the same time, moral maturity is more than a posture of critical inspection of former beliefs; it has to do with more than sensitivity to and tolerance of the views of others; it is nurtured not only by dilemmas and role simulations in a changing world. It is broader than and different from what is conveyed by the term "values."[9]

In short, values clarification provides an essential function in moral education but remains incomplete by the nature of its basic philosophical stance that "oughts" remain limited to individually owned values.

Developmental Learning as Moral Education

Many find the choice between indoctrination and values clarification to be a difficult one to make. Increased awareness of the difficulty of finding many people other than the writers of ethical codes willing to subscribe to them, and finding the moral relativity of values clarification an unacceptable position, "the teacher is caught in a pedagogical and moral no man's land."[10] Scharf goes on to indicate that developmental moral education differs from indoctrinative and value-clarification models of moral education in two basic ways:

1. [Developmental Moral Education] suggests that the teacher should be philosophically guided by universal ethical principles rather than by either societal values or the student's personal values.
2. [Developmental Moral Education] suggests that moral learning takes place through the changing of ideas of right and wrong in a series of six moral stages, rather than through the internalization of social behavior norms or by an increased awareness of one's own inner values.[11]

This movement centers around Lawrence Kohlberg, his colleagues, and their graduate students at Harvard where they have developed a new construct of psychological, philosophical, and educational research. "Three words—cognitive moral development—capture the essence of their work. Cognitive stresses organized thought processes. Moral involves decision making in situations where unusual values, such as the sanctity of life and the need for authority come into conflict... development suggests that patterns of thinking about moral issues improve qualitatively over time."[12]

Psychological interest in morality has been described as determining "what is," while philosophy's concern is "what ought to be." Kohlberg as a developmental psychologist has broken new and controversial ground by plainly stating that moral development is prescriptive in nature and takes place in an invariant sequence. Individuals move through stages in

---

[9]Edwin J. Delattre and William J. Bennett, "Where the Values Movement Goes Wrong," *Change*, February, 1979, p. 41.

[10]Scharf, p. 5.

[11]*Ibid.* If unfamiliar with Kohlberg's stage theory, see Table I.

[12]Edwin Fenton, "Moral Education: The Research Findings," *Social Education*, April 1976, p. 191.

moral development, and higher moral stages are better than lower ones for two basic reasons: (1) Problems can be solved at higher stages better than at lower stages, and (2) higher stages are more differentiated, more integrated, and more universal.[13] The highest of the moral stages (stage 6) is characterized by ethical principles of universal justice, the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.[14] Kohlberg further states that "justice is not a rule or set of rules; it is a moral principle. By a moral principle we mean a mode of choosing which is universal, a rule of choosing which we want all people to adopt always in all situations... there are exceptions to rules but no exception to principles."[15]

Kohlberg defends the prescriptiveness of justice as a preferable moral stage at length in an essay entitled "From Is to Ought" and attacks "the common assumption of the cultural relativity of ethics, on which almost all contemporary social scientific theorizing about morality is based."[16]

Individuals are scored as to a predominate stage level through a complex interview process that interprets responses to a series of moral dilemmas. This research has indicated one of the more controversial aspects of Kohlberg's cognitive moral development theory: A given stage of cognitive development is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the parallel moral stage. Does this mean, then, that morality depends on intelligence? Lickona indicates that "the research appears to confirm a common intuition: Being smart and being moral are not the same. Cognitive power may be needed for principled moral thought, but it is not enough. History is full of examples of how human intelligence can be turned to great evil..."[17] Kohlberg would agree and comments:

> To act in a morally high way requires a high stage of moral reasoning. One cannot follow moral principles (stages 5 and 6) if one does not understand or believe in them. One can, however, reason in terms of such principles and not live up to them. A variety of factors determines whether a particular person will live up to his stage of moral reasoning in a particular situation, though moral stage is a good predictor of action in various experimental and naturalistic settings.[18]

Following Jean Piaget's concept of cognitive development moving through logical reasoning stages, "Kohlberg gives no specific age guidelines for

---

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive Developmental Approach," in *Moral Development and Behavior*. Ed. Thomas Lickona (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976) p. 35.

[15] Lawrence Kohlberg, "Education for Justice: A Modern Statement of the Platonic View," in *Moral Education: Five Lectures*. Eds. N.F. Sizer and T. R. Sizer (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University, 1970) pp. 69-70.

[16] Lawrence Kohlberg, "From Is to Ought," in *Cognitive Development and Epistemology*. Ed. Theodore Mischel (New York: Academic Press, 1971) p. 155.

[17] Thomas Lickona, "Critical Issues in the Study of Moral Development and Behavior," *Moral Development and Behavior*. Ed. Thomas Lickona (New York: Holt, Rineholt and Winston, 1976) p. 21.

[18] Kohlberg, 1976, p. 32.

each of his stages," but "he does state that attainment of a stage level is dependent upon underlying cognitive development."[19]

Kohlberg's concept of moral development is not without its critics. Some assert that moral prescriptiveness from lower to higher stages does, in fact, not exist, and that Kohlberg has deserted psychological observation for philosophical postulates. Others deny an invariant progression from lower to higher stages. Another issue has centered around the subjectivity of the stage scoring system. Kohlberg himself has modified his scoring methodology in recent years and has recently questioned whether an identifiable Stage 6 (Universal-Ethical-Principle orientation) is supported by research results.[20] One thing can be stated with certainty; over the past 20 years Kohlberg and his associates have stirred a remarkable and productive debate in the area of moral development. While problems remain, Kohlberg's research findings consistently produce the clearest data available in the field of moral development.

If Kohlberg is correct in affirming that morality is developmental and that a prescriptiveness from lower to higher stages indeed exists, what are the implications for moral education?[21]

Education Strategies

John Dewey saw moral development as the aim of education and stated that "what we need in education is a genuine faith in the existence of moral principles which are capable of effective application."[22] This concept was also expressed by Immanuel Kant and his belief that "our ultimate aim [in education] is the formation of character."[23] Along with Piaget, both of these educational philosophers have deeply influenced Lawrence Kohlberg. He comments that "the notion that the aim of the schools should be stimulation of human development is a scientific, ethical and practical concept which provides the frame work for a new kind of educational psychology."[24]

Only recently have strategies been developed that attempt to promote moral growth in light of the cognitive developmental model. Kohlberg and his associates designed a course that utilized moral dilemmas to elicit moral reasoning. Used with junior high and high school students and Harvard undergraduates, the results of pre-tests and post-tests indicated

---

[19]William D. Boyce and Larry C. Jensen, *Moral Reasoning* (Lincoln, Neb: University of Nebraska Press, 1978) p. 107.

[20]Kohlberg, Lawrence, "Education For a Just Society," in *Moral Development, Moral Education,* and *Kohlberg*. Ed. Brenda Munsey (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1980) pp. 458-459.

[21]For the most recent conceptualization of Kohlberg's ideas see Kohlberg, *Essays on Moral Development*, Vol I (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981.

[22]John Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education* (Boston: Houghton Miffin Company, 1909) p. 18.

[23]Immanuel Kant, *Education* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960 reprint) p. 98.

[24]Lawrence Kohlberg and Rochelle Mayer, "Development as the Aim of Education," in *Stage Theories of Cognitive* and *Moral Development: Criticism and Application* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Education Review, Reprint No. 13, 1978) p. 125.

progressive stage movement. "Two control classes were studied: one, a traditional social psychology course, and the other a traditional academic moral philosophy course. In neither was there any change in reasoning from pre-test to post-test."[25]

Kohlberg states:

> The teacher's role was to elicit disagreement and then to probe socratically for reasons why different solutions where chosen. In a typical high school class, different students would offer Stage 2, Stage 3 and Stage 4 reasoning. In such discussions, students showing Stage 2 reasoning are challenged by Stage 3 students and tend to change their own thinking upward to deal with it.[26]

Other variations were attempted as strategies developed. Stage theory presentations, small group or section discussions and assigned papers on their personal ethical stances produced positive empirical results. The key, as discussed above, would seem to be that moral reasoning about realistic dilemmas and exposure to moral reasoning at least one stage higher than one's own promotes movement toward the higher stage.

Numerous educational models of moral development have begun to adopt Kohlberg's findings. In *A Leadership Model for Organizational Ethics* Ayers and Clement call for utilization of ethical scenarios beginning at the officer advanced course level. It states that "training at this level should begin to focus on recognition and correction of ethical dilemmas."[27] Various Army service schools have prepared materials to meet this need (a few examples are the United States Army Transportation, Infantry, and Military Police Schools and the Command and General Staff College).

In my experience the methodology used in moral dilemma education is critical. A strategy for teaching a moral dilemma involves far more than presenting a class with a scenario and hoping something useful will "fall out." (See Table II).

Another critical aspect is the selection of an appropriate dilemma. Galbraith and Jones indicate that a dilemma story should include five essential ingredients:

1. *Focus:* The situation in the dilemma should focus on the lives of the students, the course content, or contemporary society. The dilemma should be considered genuine.

2. *Central Character:* The dilemma should involve a central character or primary group of characters around which the dilemma remains focused. Students make moral judgements about what the central characters should do.

---

[25]Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Implications of Moral Stages for Adult Education," *Religious Education*, March-April, 1977, p. 125.

[26]*Ibid.*, p. 199.

[27]Ayers and Clement, p. 59.

3. *Choice:* The story or situation must involve a choice for the central character. The character in the dilemma should have two action alternatives which present a definite conflict. Neither action choice should represent a culturally approved right answer.

4. *Moral Issues:* Moral dilemmas revolve around key moral issues. Kohlberg identifies some of these issues:

* Social Norms	* Personal Conscience	* Punishment
* Civil Liberties	* Contract	* Truth
* Life		
	* Property	* Role and Issues
* Sex	* Authority	of Acceptance

5. A "Should" Question: Each moral dilemma ends with a specific question which asks about what the character *should* do in the situation... the "should" question keeps the discussion centered on moral judgements in a dilemma.[28]

The writing of dilemmas that meet these rigorous standards will not be easy but offers the best chance that genuine intra-personal conflict will occur and encourage the student to search out other levels of reasoning that provide more satisfactory resolutions. Galbraith and Jones provide an excellent summary of Kohlberg's theory and practical strategies for dilemma construction and presentation.

Other approaches can also be effective. Reading the works of moral philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Mill, Dewey, and Rawls can be effective for students at higher levels of cognition. In most instances, however, sufficient course time is simply not available. Course length permitting, both methods (dilemmas and discussion of readings) would be preferable. In any case (as already cited) empirical results indicate that dilemmas provide the best possibility for the advancement of moral reasoning.

Derek Bok echos many of these concepts when he argues that "in view of the disadvantages of the traditional approaches, more attention is being given to problem-oriented courses in ethics. These classes are built around a series of contemporary moral dilemmas. these classes generally proceed by discussion rather than lecturing."[29] Three objectives are listed for such instruction:

(1) To help students become more alert in discovering the moral issues that arise in their own lives.
(2) To teach students to reason carefully about ethical issues. Many people feel that moral problems are matters of personal opinion and that it is pointless even to argue about them since each person's views will turn on values that cannot be established or refuted on logical grounds... this is simply not true....

---

[28]Ronald E. Galbraith and Thomas M. Jones, *Moral Reasoning: A Teaching Handbook for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom* (Minneapolis: Greenhaven Press, 1976) pp. 38-39.

[29]Derek Bok, "Can Ethics Be Taught?", *Change*, February 1978, p. 38.

(3) A final objective of these courses is to help students clarify their moral aspirations.[30]

Teaching models based on a problem-oriented curriculum are few and far between despite their virtues, and are "still regarded with indifference or outright skepticism...."[31]

Another difficulty in utilizing a problem-oriented model for moral education is that of teacher qualifications. Knowledge of the discipline of moral philosophy and the general or specialized "world" of the students, as well as interpersonal skills in leading vigorous but controlled classroom discussions are necessities. The task of identifying and training such teacher candidates needs to be a first priority.

I offer these strategies fully cognizant of the difficulties inherent in any educational attempt to promote moral growth. One approaches so complex a subject (hopefully) with fear and trepidation—and a profound sense of humility as to "pat" solutions. We must realize, however, that value formation is inherently a part of every educational process whether we desire it or not. The only remaining questions, it seems to me, are how do we create an environment that strategically attempts to promote moral growth as an educational "ought," and what processes are most helpful in accomplishing this task.

Conclusion

Kenneth Kenniston has noted that in America "there has seldom been so great a confusion about what is valid and good..."[32] Cognitive dissonance is a way of life for many and "future shock" bespeaks of being guided more by the speedometer than the compass. The "good" seems difficult to identify and harder still to appropriate for oneself. From the hedonistic lyrics of Rod Stewart that recommend:

> Don't say a word my virgin child, Just let your inhibitions run wild.

to the moral perscriptiveness of Micah claiming that:

> "He has showed you, O man, what is good. And what does the Lord require of you? To act justly and to love mercy And to walk humbly with your God,"[33]

we find ourselves awash with conflicting testimony as to what values by which we should be guided.

Cognitive-developmental theory with its clear renunciation of ethical relativism, prescriptiveness toward a principled morality, and positive implications for moral education, deserves our careful consideration.

---

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Kenneth Kenniston, *The Uncommitted* (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1964) p. 4.

[33] Micah 6:8, New International Version.

TABLE I: Definition of Moral Stages*

I. Preconventional Level

Cultural labels and rules such as good and bad, right or wrong are central to the child and are interpreted in terms of the physical or hedonistic consequences of action. The level is divided into two stages:

Stage 1: *The punishment-and-obedience orientation.* The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness.

Stage 2: *The instrumental-relativist orientation.* Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and sometimes, the needs of others. Reciprocity centers around "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

II. Conventional Level

Maintaining the expectations of the family, group or nation is seen as important in its own right. Conformity is the rule. The following stages are:

Stage 3: *The interpersonal concordance or "good boy-nice girl" orientation.* Intentions are crucial in judging behavior. Conformity to stereotypical images.

Stage 4: *The law and order orientation.* Authority is central. The given social order is supported by doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining societal values.

III. Post Conventional, Autonomous, Or Principled Level

Attempts are made to define moral values and principles that have validity apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles. This level also has two stages:

Stage 5: *The social-contract. legalistic orientation.* This is the "official" morality of the American Constitution. There is an emphasis upon the "legal point of view" but also an impulse toward changing laws and society toward a more rational structure with an "honoring" of individual rights.

Stage 6: *The universal-ethical-principle orientation.* Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles. These principles tend to be abstract and ethical (the Golden Rule).the categorical imperative rather than concrete moral rules like the Ten Commandments. They center around universal principles of justice with respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

*Adapted from Lawrence Kohlberg, *Essays on Moral Development*, Vol. I (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981), pp. 410-412.

TABLE II: A Strategy For Teaching a Moral Dilemma*

1. *Confront A Moral Dilemma:* Present the dilemma, state the circumstances and define terms. Personalize the moral dilemma for the central character.

2. *State Tentative Position:* Reflect on individual position, establish individual positions, establish class position and establish reasons for positions.

3. *Examine the Reasoning:* Publish reasons in a subgroup centering on issues, analogous dilemmas and consequences.

4. *Reflect on Individual Position:* Summarize reasoning and state reasons in larger group.

---

*Adapted from Galbraith and Jones, *Moral Reasoning: A Teaching Handbook for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom* (Minneapolis: Green-Haven Press, 1976), p. 64.

Bibliography

Ayres, Donna C., and Stephen D. Clement. *A Leadership Model for Organizational Ethics.* Indianapolis: United States Army Administration Center, 1978. (Leadership Series Monograph No.13).

Bok, Derek. "Can Ethics Be Taught?" *Change*, October, 1978.

Boyce, William D., and Larry C. Jensen. *Moral Reasoning.* Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Delattre, Edwin J., and William J. Bennett. "Where the Values Movement Goes Wrong." *Change*, February, 1979.

Dewey, John. *Moral Principles in Education.* Boston: Houghton Miffin Company, 1909.

Fenton, Edwin. "Moral Education: The Research Findings." *Social Education*, April, 1976.

Fowler, James. "Stages in Faith: The Structural-Developmental Perspective," in *Values and Moral Development.* Ed. T. Hennessey. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Galbraith, Ronald E., and Thomas M. Jones. *Moral Reasoning: A Teaching handbook for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom.* Minneapolis: Green-Haven Press, 1976.

Kant, Immanuel. *Education.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960 reprint.

Keizer, Herman, Jr., Published Television Editorial, TRADOC Chaplain's Bulletin—78-10, Incl 2, October, 1978.

Kenniston, Kenneth. *The Uncommitted.* New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1964.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Education for Justice: A Modern Statement of the Platonic View," in *Moral Education: Five Lectures.* Eds. N.F. Sizer and T. R. Sizer. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "From Is to Ought," in *Cognitive Development and Epistemology.* Ed. Theodore Mischel. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive Developmental Approach," in *Moral Development and Behavior.* Ed. Thomas Lickona. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "The Implications of Moral Stages for Adult Education." *Religious Education*, March-April, 1977.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Educating for a Just Society" in *Moral Develpment, Moral Education, and Kohlberg*. Ed. Brenda Munsey. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1980.

Kohlberg Lawrence. *Essays on Moral Development*, Vol I. San Francisco. Harper and Row, 1981.

Kohlberg, Lawrence and Rochelle Mayer. "Development as the Aim of Education," in *Stage Theories of Cognitive and Moral Development: Criticisms and Application*. Harvard Educational Review, Reprint No. 13. Cambridge, Mass: 1978.

Lickona, Thomas, "Critical Issues in the Study of Moral Development and Behavior," in *Moral Development and Behavior*. Ed. Thomas Lickona. New York: Holt; Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Raths, Louis E., Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. *Values and Teaching*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966.

Scharf, Peter. "New Trends in Moral Education." *The Church School*, November, 1979.

Simon, Sidney B., Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum. *Values Clarification*. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc.. 1972.

Snook, I.A. *Indoctrination* and *Education*. London: Routledge and Keganpaul, 1972.

---

*Adapted from Galbraith and Jones, *Moral Reasoning: A Teaching Handbook for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom* (Minneapolis: Green-Haven Press, 1976) p. 64.

PERIODICAL REVIEWS

Singles are Lonely Swingers: True or False?

"Singles: An Examination of Two Stereotypes" by Leonard Cargan in *Family Relations* July 1981, The National Council on Family Relations, 1219 University Ave. SE, Minneapolis, Minn.55414.

The two prime stereotypes regarding "singles" are these: they are lonelier than "marrieds", and they are real "swingers".

A recent study, in the typical population area of Dayton, Ohio, surveyed a statistical sample carefully balanced to include those never married, those married for the first time, re-married couples, and divorced singles, The results were interesting.

Lacking a partner, singles must be lonely people, right? Only partly right. Never-marrieds were the *least* likely to feel lonely. The singles *most* likely to feel lonely were those in the divorced catagory.

The never-married may not feel the lack of a kind of companionship they have never had, whereas the divorced feel the contrast strongly. Besides, 66% of the never-married do not live alone; they live with family, or have a room-mate.

So as to singles being lonely, it's apparently not so much a matter of being single as of being single by way of divorce.

How about the "Swinging Single" stereotype. Is the sex life of singles widely different from that of marrieds? According to the study, yes. But with some surprises.

25 per cent of the never-marrieds had also never had sex with anyone. And two thirds of them had had only three or less sex partners. Of those in their first marriage, 55% restricted their sex life to their spouse exclusively. So the stereotype of the "Swinging Single" doesn't really hold up. A *majority* of the singles surveyed had had three or less sexual partners in their lives. That's not celibacy or monogamy, but it doesn't add up to free-swinging wildness, either.

The "swinging singles" label as regards numerous sexual partners was found to apply only to a small percentage—mostly in the divorced category.

The survey also asked its respondents to rate their satisfaction with their sex life. The most *dis*satisfied were those who had the widest variety of sexual partners. Marrieds were more likely to be very satisfied with their sex lives than any other category.

Bottom Line: Stereotyping single people as "lonely" is not war-

ranted. Stereotyping single people as "swingers" is not warranted. And apparently—single or not—promiscuity as a cure for loneliness,or a means to a sense of satisfaction, is a dud—and most of the people surveyed act as if they know it.

—Jake Moon

An Understandable Misapprehension

"Whither the Neutron Bomb? A Moral Defense of Nuclear Radiation Weapons" by Samuel T. Cohen, in *Parameters* (June 1981), US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA. 17013.

Since World War II, the western countries, led by the United States, mounted an effort to rid the world of nuclear weapons on the ground that they represented a potential threat to civilization. Cohen supports the dissenting voice of David Lilienthal which, in 1963, went virtually unheeded in U.S. policy: "The fantastic destructive power of the Atom is a reality. The conclusions drawn from this fact are myths. Those myths are still at the foundation of our policies and our outlook."

If western political belief, says Cohen, which is greatly influenced by Judeo-Christian beliefs, dictate that conventional weapons be preferred over nuclear weapons, these beliefs must stand up in the light of technological and real world considerations. Cohen addresses this issue in the area of two battlefield weapons—the neutron bomb and the nuclear barrier.

The author points out that the actual physical destruction of the neutron bomb depends on how high above the earth's surface the bomb is burst. If burst low enough, enemy personnel over an area of one square mile would be incapacitated and unable to fight. In contrast, conventional weaponry causes immense damage to civilian structures. Had neutron weapons been available in earlier wars, widespread civilian.misery and destruction need not have resulted.

The moral aspects of ground war as well as civilian plight says Cohen, must also be considered. In past wars, a huge toll of military personnel were permanently maimed. The fusion radiated neutron bomb, not to be confused with the fission radiated pile which powered the Three Mile Island reactor, does not disable, although there are temporary distresses of nausea, diarrhea, and vomiting. And the number of those who develop leukemia from being in the exposed area are miniscule, he claims, in comparison with the number of long-term casualties resulting from a large scale conventional war.

Cohen sees the nuclear barrier as a defensive device which would deter conflict by emplacing an impenetrable barrier between potential combatants in contrast to solving international disputes by direct engagement on the field of battle. It would act as a passive rather than active

defense, in that responsibility for the aggressor's death would be solely his responsibility—a moral shading which Cohen believes many would find important.

Moral deliberations have fixated on the "mass destruction" potential of the more familiar nuclear and thermo-nuclear bomb, says the author. "However... failure to capitalize on the unique effects of radiation weapons... could constitute blind immoralism of a far more serious order."

—Elaine Tupy

A Formula For Profit

"The Cost of Promotion" by Fred For Profit Clarkson, in *Sojourners* (Nov.1981), 1309 L St. N.W. Wash. D.C. . 20005.

The infant formula scandal, thought to be unique to the Third World, is also a serious health problem in the U.S. Of the one million who die annually as a result of bottle feeding, 5000 of these deaths occur in the U.S. due to lack of clean water, sanitation, adequate family income, and illiterate parents.

The main difference between bottle feeding in the US and the Third World, says Clarkson, is that ready-to-feed formulas and liquid concentrates are used more often here than the powdered formula. This causes a danger when illiterate parents can't distinguish between the two.

Clarkson cites Charlotte Frey, of St. Joseph's Hospital in New Jersey, who says baby bottle disease is a hidden factor of poverty in the U.S. "I know plenty of instances where the babies are getting formula, but the parents aren't getting enough to eat." She also describes the opposite where the formula is over-diluted and leads to malnutrition.

Wilma Warran of the Virginia Water Project says 50% of the wells in the U.S. are contaminated due to privies located uphill in rural areas which run down into the water supply.

A study filed with the federal government by Public Advocates revealed that even the not-so-poor may be adversely affected if never breast-fed or prematurely weaned. In a middle class population in Cooperstown, N.Y., bottle fed infants were hospitalized three times more frequently during the first year of life and 15 times more frequently in the first four months.

Unfortunately, says Clarkson, most doctors receive little or no training in human lactation making it all too easy for doctors to prescribe formula rather than treating such simple problems as raw nipples. Compounding the problem is that many formula companies routinely distribute formula to women about to be discharged, which is likely to be interpreted as encouragement of formula feeding by the doctor.

Recognizing this, the industry often courts the health professionals.

The ethical problem was summarized in a recent letter to Pediatrics Magazine: "It is the age old, but underappreciated, psychological influence of financial support on behavior which is at the core of the whole issue, especially when funds are short and on a *possibly* continuing basis."

—Elaine Tupy

Minimizing the Malevolent

"The Electronic Church's Aesthetic of Evil" by S. Dennis Ford, in *The Christian Century* (Oct. 28, 1981), 407 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. 60605.

The electronic church, with its daily stories of degradation and human disaster, is fascinated with the concept of evil. So writes author Ford, who attempts to explain this phenomena. While it could be explained theologically, that in the confessional mode, the darkness before the light is a legitimate motif of the Christian tradition, Ford suggests that the presence of such accounts in the church's programming indicates nothing less than an aesthetic of evil. "By this I do not mean that the aesthetic is evil in itself but that attention to evil is an integral part of the electronic church's sense of what is beautiful.

Ford sees evil's function in the electronic church as analgous to the functioning of the "ugly" in art. He juxtaposes three major theories for the presence of the ugly in art against the presence of evil in the electronic church. The first, the transformational theorizes that evil is indeed present in art but is not transformed by the total context of the work. The larger beauty is all the more so because it encompasses occasional discords. In the aesthetic of the electronic church, says Ford, every evil is transformed and is thus temporary and insignificant in the light of the Christian context.

The second theory, the educational or didactic, justifies ugliness because of its instructional value. Because ugliness exists, it would be unrealistic not to depict it. In the context of the electronic church, one comes away from a TV program about alcoholism or world hunger feeling as if he's learned something about the real world.

Last, the pleasure theory, is the most difficult to accept because it reveals human nature in an unfavorable light, arguing that we actually enjoy the ugly. "What in real life may be repulsive becomes an opportunity for voyeurism and novelty."

Ford maintains that in the first two instances, the electronic church denies the permanence or seriousness of evil in that it is either transformed in the Christian context or justified in terms of an educational function. No one would readily admit that the study of evil is pleasurable. Yet, says Ford, the electronic church so often depicts evil and denies its seriousness that the pleasure theory best articulates its sensibilities, resulting in mere titillation. "The prominent place evil assumes in the stories broadcast

indulges our need for this strange form of 'beauty' without granting an enabling vision."

—Elaine Tupy

Sidestepping Triassic Reptiles

"Ethics without the Sermon" by Laura L. Nash, in *Harvard Business Review* (Nov-Dec.1981), P.O. Box 3000, Woburn, Mass. 01888.

Twelve questions for examining the ethics of a business decision

1 Have you defined the problem accurately?
2 How would you define the problem if you stood on the other side of the fence?
3 How did this situation occur in the first place?
4 To whom and to what do you give your loyalty as a person and as a member of the corporation?
5 What is your intention in making this decision?
6 How does this intention compare with the probable results?
7 Whom could your decision or action injure?
8 Can you discuss the problem with the affected parties before you make your decision?
9 Are you confident that your position will be as valid over a long period of time as it seems now?
10 Could you disclose without qualm your decision or action to your boss, your CEO, the board of directors, your family, society, as a whole?
11 What is the symbolic potential of your action if understood? If misunderstood?
12 Under what conditions would you allow exceptions to your stand?

For the corporate executive who asks, "How do we as a corporation examine our ethical concerns," the answer is complex and frustrating. While many executives believe corporate values and corporate operations are intertwined, they must, for purposes of analysis, says Nash, uncoil the business ethics helix and examine both closely.

Business, says Nash, has not yet developed a workable process by which corporate values can be articulated. She does not believe that philosophy, which has been sorting out issues of ethics through the ages is the answer. "Like some triassic reptile, it lumbers in the past without confronting the reality of practical business concerns."

What Nash does offer as a preliminary solution is a set of 12 questions that involves a process of ethical inquiry which she sees as both

comprehensible to the executive and which serves as a way to articulate their responsibilities and lay them open for examination. The process serves to focus on what one expects of the "ethical" corporation which assumes some difference between private and corporate goodness. One cannot, says Nash, expect the corporation to act in the capacity of a good man which implies a heavy responsibility to know the good and achieve it. Nor should the corporation operate amorally, implying that corporate goodness would have no regard for the social implications whereby profits are made. Nash sees business ethics acting most appropriately for corporate man when it defines corporate morality somewhere between these two areas—"where it is expected to avoid social injury while focusing on its purpose as a profit making organization." She adds, however, that its moral capacity "does not extend to determining by itself what will improve the general welfare."

Last, says Nash, there are compelling reasons for holding such discussions whether a policy-decision is generated or not. The process facilitates talk about a subject traditionally reserved for one's conscience. It builds a cohesive managerial process as common concerns emerge from vastly different operations. The process acts as an information resource, it helps improve the range and nature of alternatives, and it helps uncover differences between the values and practicality of that implementation.

—Elaine Tupy

The "Moral Majority"—An Evangelical Minority

"Protestantism and the Evangelicals", by Cullen Murphy, in the *Wilson Quarterly*, Autumn 1981, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 20560

The designations "Evangelical Christians" and "The Moral Majority" are not synonymous. Neither is political activism by evangelical Protestants anything new. In the 1800's, evangelicals led crusades against slavery, urban vice and alcohol, etc. And they campaigned for a tax-supported public school system. The fact is that historically, an individual's political activism is often a corollary of his religious commitment. In other words, people who care... get involved.

The surge of political activism that struck some observers as "new" in the 1970's reflected a great numerical increase in the community of evangelical Christians. A 1979 Gallup Poll indicated that about 31 million Americans considered themselves evangelicals; perhaps half of the nation's Protestant population. The heading "Evangelical", however, covers a broad range of variation; alarmed observers, after the 1980 election, erred in heaping all evangelicals together as "Fundamentalists". Fundamentalism is merely a subculture within mainstream evangelicalism.

Look carefully into the vast tent of evangelical faith, and you will find not one but a dozen rings in action, with Fundamentalism only one of the acts.

Evangelicals include the "Peace Church" conservatives such as Mennonites and Quakers; Arminian conservatives descended from the 19th century Disciples of Christ, as seen in today's Churches of Christ; others with roots deep in the immigrant experience, such as Lutherans, the Dutch Calvinists of the Christian Reformer Church, and assorted Italian, Ukranian and German Baptists as well as the German Pietists; also Adventists of varied denomination; Wesleyans and conservative Calvinists. *None* of these fit the Fundamentalist mold.

The point is, Evangelicals—Fundamentalist or not—are a diverse lot, and media preoccupation with the Evangelical Right has perhaps at times diverted attention from the existence of the real evangelical majoriiy—the one in the middle.

—Jake Moon

Vatican II: Is It for Real?

"A Catholic Romance with Modernity", by Jay P. Dolan, in the *Wilson Quarterly*, Autumn 1981, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution. Washington, DC 20560

In October of 1962, the Second Vatican Council was convened. Roman Catholicism has not been the same since. American nuns turn out in skirts or slacks; priests,wearing shirt and tie,argue with church authorities about birth control and divorce—and when they say Mass, they say it in English. The question is: based on past history, is this "Romance with Modernity" likely to last?

Twice before in America, Catholicism fell in love with modernity. In each case, the pendulum swung back again. First the American Revolution created an egalitarian atmosphere in which America's 25,000 Catholics could now vote and/or run for office. Relations between Catholics and Protestants grew more cordial. Mixed marriages were common.

Soon a new concept of Roman Catholicism—its chief spokesman, John Carroll—was being voiced. First; Catholics in America wanted to be as independent of foreign influence as possible. (The Pope, in 1773, had suppressed the Jesuit order; John Carroll—like most priests in America—was a Jesuit.) A second key point was religious toleration, and the separation of church and state. (Catholics in America knew that if any religion were established as a state-supported church in the U.S., it would not be Catholicism.) They also wanted to conduct services in English. Laymen elected by parishoners ran the temporal affairs of the Parish.

But with the turn of the century, all this changed, By 1795, through

large-scale immigration of Europeans (including priests) 8 out of 10 priests in the U.S. were foreign-born. In 1808, bishops for new American dioceses were appointed. By Rome. Not one was an American. By 1850, a European-style clerical supremacy in the parishes was re-established.

The late 1800's marked the start of a second "Romance with Modernity". Industrial America was emerging; first, big business. Then labor unions. And along came Darwin.

From the start, Catholic leaders stood with the workers. Most American Catholics were laborers, Some Catholic intellectuals espoused Darwinism. Scholarly journals sprang up. But in 1889, Pope Leo XIII condemned "Americanism" and its "different" view of the church. His successor, Pius X, finished the job in 1907 with his anti-modernist encyclical, *Pascendi*. Once again, the honeymoon was over.

Winds of change came again in the mid-1900's. Catholics were no longer typically blue-collar; witness the election of John F. Kennedy. Vatican II reflected a new swing to modernity.

But today, in religion as in politics, we lean toward conservatism. Pope John Paul II wants priests to stay out of politics; to remain celibate; and he feels the clergy should control faculty appointments in Catholic theological schools.

Still, the impact of Vatican II is worldwide; a change hard to reverse. Catholics are better educated; they demand intelligible answers, not authoritative pronouncements, about 20th Century life-problems. So it just may be that, this time, the Catholic romance with modernity will turn out to be more of a marriage than a passing infatuation.

—Jake Moon

America's Jews: Loyalties in Conflict

"Jewish Loyalties", by Nathan Glazer, in the *Wilson Quarterly*, Autumn 1981, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC 20560

In the last 30 years, the American Jewish community has become the most numerous, prosperous, influential, secure Jewish population in history. Even so, since the 1960's, conflicting loyalties have made American Jews uneasy.

Paradoxically, one cause is our effort to move toward a more equal multiracial society. Do not Jews in general welcome and support this? Of course. But our approach to the problem has in it subtle, implicit conflicts of loyalty.

For example: Government agencies, set up to promote and ensure equal opportunity for minority groups, require reports from schools, universities, business—aimed at policing the effective inclusion of minor-

ity groups. Jews feel a commitment to the idea of equal opportunity for all groups. But there is also their loyalty to the ideal of *individual* rights. The idea of being forced to report on—or be judged as—a *group*, according to race, ethnic origin or religion, has a certain repugnance. Jews—for generations committed to *color-blindness* in rooting out discrimination—now see color-*consciousness* becoming a requirement in government machinery aimed at ensuring equality of opportunity to all groups.

The problem is, now all of a sudden the Jewish commitment to color-blindness in areas like law, medicine, higher education tends to align them against quotas—ratios by race. Their commitment to *individual* rights tends to clash with efforts to enhance *group* rights.

A second major clash of loyalties: Israel and Israel's interests—and America and U.S. interests. Since the Six Day War of 1967—when it seemed for a moment that Israel might be obliterated — Israel has become a concern of *primary* importance to the Jews of America. The problem comes when the question arises: "What if, at some point, the interests of America and Israel diverge? Which loyalty comes first?"

A third conflict of loyalties underlies the first two. In both the conflict over equal rights and the question of priority between U.S. and Israeli interests, the American Jew wants to *avoid* standing out, being highly visible. He does *not* think it is to his advantage to have it pointed out how successful Jews have been in entering esteemed and lucrative professions, or how special American Jewish support for Israel is. The problem: how to *avoid* high visibility as successful and/or politically effective Jews — and still remain identifiably Jewish? Thus loyalty to *individual* choice and personal fulfillment may come into conflict with loyalty to *group* demands rooted in ancient tradition and religion.

Still,there should be hope in the fact that Jews have found, in America, a deeply rooted tolerance for diversity and commitment to human rights—a climate that should provide a safe haven in which they can work out these conflicts.

—Jake Moon

Survival Despite The Setbacks

"The Perils and Impact of Independent Churches" by Elmer L. Towns, in *Christianity Today* (Jan. 1, 1982), 465 Gundersen Dr., Carol Stream, Ill. 60187.

One of the most important forces in American religious life is the independent church movement. Towns defines an "independent church" as an assembly of believers that does not belong to any denomination and which has no organized connection to an outside hierarchy. It is usually a hybrid, emphasizing democratic control, although in many instances. the pastor is the government. They emphasize the inerrancy of Scripture, the deity of

Christ, the sinfulness of man, Christ's atonement, resurrection, and second coming, and the necessity of repentence and faith for salvation. They have generally not emphasized the theology of the church and sacraments.

Its unparalleled growth, says Towns, is attributed to church splits, hard pioneering evangelism, and, most significantly in recent years, old independent churches giving birth to new ones. This growth has been matched by a surge of non-denominational schools, missionary societies, literature ministries, and youth agencies.

Explosive growth has brought problems. Independent church leaders have discovered that independence doesn't solve the problems of church government. outreach, and doctrine. Few checks and balances restrain these churches, and slipshod financial policies have hampered them. Pastors have been short-changed because of insufficient funds. The churches have also suffered from the ego trips of pastors subject to no authority than their own. One of the hardships is that when the church needs to find a new pastor, there are no denominational files to draw on, and in some cases, unqualified candidates for the ministry are quickly ordained. Though they have made attempts for fellowship with other groups, independent churches have been limited in cooperative evangelistic and social outreach.

In spite of these weaknesses, Towns believes the independent churches will continue to flourish. The fact remains, he points out, that people abandoned their churches for lack of orthodoxy, biblical preaching, evangelistic zeal, and missions. They found these things in independent churches, along with stability and a freedom to innovate and support a variety of causes. "More growth seems a safe prediction, because the public's hunger for solid, understandable, practical Bible teaching shows no signs of abating."

—Elaine Tupy

Private Schools: To Aid, or Not to Aid...

"Private schools, public schools, and the public interest", by James Coleman, in *The Public Interest*, No. 64, Summer 1981, National Affairs, Inc., 10 East 53rd St., New York N.Y., 10022.

Parochial and other private schools: should they be given aid from public funds, or not? Some people have proposed public funding to make private schools more accessible to the general public. Other people have proposed that private schools be required to meet some sort of racial-balance criteria, or lose their tax-exempt status.

Those who favor public aid to private schools say: (1)such schools provide a better education; (2) attendance is now limited to those who can afford the tuition; (3) reducing that expense would make better education

more accessible to the public.

Those against aid to private schools say: (1) such schools segregate elements of society, by drawing off the most affluent; (2) *among themselves*, such shcools stratify *economically*; (3) they segregate *racially* because they draw off white students from the public school system. (4) A final argument has to do with using public funds to support schools which serve primarily affiliates of a particular church or religion.

Do private schools further segregation? According to Coleman's testing, the question should be: "Is there more segregation *overall* in our education system because it includes private schools?"

The apparent answer is: "Not really." More than 90 per cent of all high school students are in public-school systems. So that's where almost all of the segregation problems are: where almost all of the students are. About 6 per cent attend Catholic private schools, and the rest other kinds of private schools.

Do private schools provide a better education? Survey indicates: (1) Discipline in Catholic and other private schools is stronger than most public schools; (2) these schools have fewer student problems; (3) they also have a higher level of student achievement; (4) there is a connection.

But: in a minority of public high schools where discipline is strong and academic standards high—the levels of student achievement are much the same as in the private schools.

Problem: Public schools generally are under more restraints when it comes to putting teeth into school discipline: suspending or expelling students, for example. These restraints are often part of Federal or State regulations; integral to Federal or State funding packages.

Should there be aid for private schools from public funds? Clearly Mr. Coleman thinks so. But he also argues that government intervention in the setting of public school policies has made public education an "over-regulated industry", and has resulted in the slackening of academic and disciplinary standards. In view of this, perhaps there is an unspoken note of hesitation in the article's advocacy of aid to the private school from the funds of the general public.

—Jake Moon

Human Resources Double

"Training Men and Women for Androgynous Behaviors in Organizations" by Alice G. Sargent, in *Group and Organization Studies* (Sept.1981), 8517 Production Ave., P.O. Box 26240, San Diego, Calif. 92126

Androgeny suggests that traditionally masculine and feminine behaviors reside in varying degrees in every individual. Author Sargent believes that

in the field of human resource management, androgeny provides a way to growth and development by encouraging individuals to encompass the entire range of human behaviors.

Sargent points to the management theories of Blake and Mouton (1978) and Hershey and Blanchard (1974) which suggest that the best models for managerial effectiveness encompass a range of behaviors and skills which include analytical reasoning and problem solving as well as caring about and dealing with people and their feelings.

Helping behaviors have failed to take hold in organizations, says Sargent, because they are contrary to current sex-role expectations. Organizations more readily accept traditionally male behaviors from women than they do traditionally female behaviors from men. Whereas a woman is expected to display rational and analytical behavior in her work, it is not as acceptable for men to show their caring and nurturing side in business. Another pitfall is that women, in trying to succeed, bury their expressive and caring traits and instead act out the stereotypical male traits because organizations reward neither feminine nor androgenous behavior. By trying to assimilate women into a predominantly male culture and value system, Sargent believes organizations lose what each group could learn from the other. Traditional role stereotypes can be costly, maintains Sargent. Male behavior includes aggression, violence, victimization, identity questions, and fear of self-disclosure. "Women, on the other hand, tend to deny the presence of power issues in an all-female group and to overplay the interpersonal issues in order to act as if all group members were equal." After being "socialized" in an organization, women tend to leave behind expressed affection in order to avoid being seen as a sex object. If, says Sargent, androgeny were adopted as a managerial style, women and men would not have to cripple themselves, and organizations would gain invaluable resources.

—Elaine Tupy

A Legal Conundrum

"Beyond Nuremberg", by Allan Gerson, in *Commentary*. Vol. 72, Number 4, October 1981, American Jewish Committee, 165 E. 56th St., New York, N.Y., 10022.

During WWII, Feodor Federenko was a prisoner in a Nazi POW camp in Poland. The Nazis selected a number of prisoners, told them they would serve as guards at a camp called Treblinka. Federenko was one of those selected. After the war, he came to the U.S. On his visa application, he said that he had been farming, during the time he was at Treblinka.

In due time he applied for and was granted U.S. citizenship. Then in the late 1970's, when he was 74, this misrepresentation came to light, and he was brought to trial. His defense argued that his mis-statement was not

"material", because his service as a guard had been "involuntary:—to have refused would have been to invite a quick bullet.

The wording of the Displaced Persons Act, under which Federenko had come to the U.S., drew no distinction between voluntary and involuntary assistance to the Nazis.

But without this distinction, what about all the Jewish survivors of death camps, now U.S. citizens, who had been forced to assist in one or another aspect of camp administration by their Nazi captors? The trial court felt it *had* to read the word "voluntary" into the act, or violate its intent.

Now the trial court further reasoned that for a prisoner-guard at Treblinka to denounce and defy the SS would have been a dramatic act of decency—also a dramatic act of self-destruction. The court didn't feel it could equitably impose such a duty on the defendant. The case was dismissed.

A furor followed and the case was appealed. In the Court of Appeals, the prosecution changed tactics. Federenko was not now being tried on the basis of assisting the Nazis, but of fraud; misrepresentation on his visa application.

There was no question; he *had* misrepresented. The question of "voluntary" or "involuntary" cooperation with the Nazis was here irrelevant, and the court ordered Federenko stripped of his U.S. Citizenship.

Now the *defendant* appealed to the Supreme Court. The Attorney General, trying the case himself, made it clear that his prime legal concern was with *illegal* immigration. A tough line on misrepresentation was essential to prevent abuse of the immigration laws.

The Supreme Court would not convict on the basis that *all* discrepancies—even minor ones—should be a basis for denaturalization. It did hold, however, that the particular information that *Federenko* held back *would* have kept him out of the country in the first place. It ruled for denaturalization.

It also ruled that the trial court had been mistaken to read "voluntary" into the Displaced Persons Act. Anglo-American criminal law has long held that while duress may excuse one for taking part in lesser crimes, it is no excuse in the taking of human life.

The Talmud makes the same point. If a man is threatened with death unless he kills another, "Let him rather kill you, but you may not kill the other man. Who can say that your blood is redder than his?" (Sanhedrin 74a)

The court's knotty problem was this: if it allowed the idea that the word "voluntary" should be read into the Displaced Persons Act, then it would have to dismiss the case on the grounds that it had not been shown that Federenko's conduct was "voluntary".

Had the Appeals Court ruling been allowed to stand as the final one, Federenko's accountability would have been for fraud and misrepresentation, rather than assisting in Nazi inhumanity. This would also have

set a dangerously broad standard for application in future immigration cases involving even minor misrepresentations.

In the end, the Supreme Court held Federenko accoutable for hiding a Nazi affiliation that would have barred him from entering the U.S. had it been known, and denaturalized him.

The (admittedly academic) question was left unresolved: "What, then, about the 'involuntary' cooperation in administering death camps that was forced upon Jewish inmates of such camps?."

—Jake Moon

A Two-Way Street

"Making the All-Volunteer Force Work: A National Service Approach" by Charles C. Moscos in *Foreign Affairs* (Fall 1981), 58 E. 68th St., New York, N.Y. 10021.

Since 1973, the U.S. has attempted to maintain an active duty military force of over two million, along with a reserve component, on a strictly voluntary basis. Not onIy is there a disproportionate number of minorities among the recruits, but there is also an unrepresentative segment of white youths in that they are coming from the least educated sector of American society. What kind of society is it that excuses the privileged from serving in the military. He maintains that it will be increasingly difficult for the military to be looked on as other than a welfare agency unless enlisted membership reflects more of a cross-section of the country.

The crucial flaw is that the present All Volunteer Force is a system based primarily on a one-dimensional market incentive. He contends that if monetary benefits were changed to long term educational benefits, more highly motivated recruits would be attracted to the military instead of those for whom immediate and short term goals are paramount.

To achieve this, he offers a three-pronged proposal. First, all federal aid for higher education would be linked to a program of voluntary national service, including military reserve duty or civilian work. For example, to be eligible for college aid, a person would be required to fulfill a three to six month service obligation in, for instance, care for the aged or helping a teacher. Recruitment and over-seeing the task would be the work of volunteer organizations. Secondly, provisions similar to a GI Bill would offer post-service educational benefits, allowing maximum federal educational benefits to those who serve on active duty. "At present it is an article of faith that bonuses are more cost-effective than educational benefits." Last, a two-track military personnel and compensation system would give maximum benefits to the career man and minimum benefits to short-termers while on duty. The incentive would be educational benefits.

Moscos believes that, under his proposal, personnel will stay in perhaps only a few years to collect these benefits, but will be more cost-

effective than long-termers with less incentive. The central issue, in Moscos' view, is whether there is a way to meet military manpower needs without direct compulsion or excessive reliance on cash inducements for recruitments. He believes his plan offers an affirmative answer.

—Elaine Tupy

Courage to Change

"Resistance in Marital Therapy" by Grace Luther and Irv Loev, in *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* (Oct. 1981), 924 W. 9th St., Upland, Calif., 91786

Marital therapists must contend with a couples' notion of change as a form of deprivation rather than enhancement of their relationship, which may cause a loss of vital interactions even if these interactions hurt the marital couple.

The therapist, states Luther and Loev, must be wary of resistance issues throughout the therapy process and recognize that change is anxiety provoking to most people. "Dyads gain security in their current patterns of relationships no matter how painful they are."

The authors cite examples where resistance in spousal therapy may arise from one spouse or both, and sometimes even the therapist. Individual resistance occurs when one maintains a fatalistic attitude toward change, making the excuse it won't work because one spouse won't change. Or he may ally with the therapist in aiding the spouse, thus avoiding his own role in the problem. It is common for one spouse to conceal his true feelings for fear of hurting the spouse. Another form of resistance occurs when the spouse, after change processes are initiated, resists therapy by threatening to end the marriage.

Collusive resistance occurs when both spouses deny the occurence of past events such as extra-marital affairs or previous marriages. They may sometimes focus away from the marital relationship and focus on a symptomatic child. And often, when emotional distance is lessened between a couple during therapy, the therapist may become an outsider and the couple may terminate therapy prematurely.

The therapist himself may inspire resistance by allying with one spouse against another, or he may act as a bearer of an individual's secrets and, as such, becomes compromised as he doesn't fully explore issues with the other person.

Luther and Loev identify courage and fear as two conflicting emotions related to the change process. The therapist's task, they point out, is to encourage change by supporting the courageous part of the patient to predominate. At the same time, he must act as adversary to that part of the patient which fears change and invite him to explore the resistance as a way

of identifying its cause, its progression, and its impact on the therapy.

—Elaine Tupy

The Performance Is What Counts

"Evangelism as Entertainment" by Robert M. Price, in *The Christian Century* (Nov. 4, 1981), 407 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. 60605

Several years ago, erstwhile evangelist Marjoe Gortner repudiated evangelism in the cinematic reproduction of Marjoe. While many wrote him off as a curiosity, author Price believes Marjoe had a valuable message: in evangelical ministry, whether the preacher believes or not *doesn't matter.*

Price touches on three aspects of popular charismatic religion to shed light on Marjoe's view which Price sees as the central question in the controversy over evangelism today.

First, Marjoe emphasized that the success of a revivalist depends on his skill in playing on people's emotions to produce money, conversion, and glossalia. Revivalists use slogans, buttons, media, and help from ad professionals to evoke these responses. Whether one does or doesn't believe in the Gospel, says Price, the result and method are the same: emotional manipulation.

The second aspect are the requests for money. Price cites Pat Robertson's "Kingdom Principles" which include advice to give one's rent or food money to the "700 Club", for, Robertson says. God will miraculously repay you. Again, maintains Price, it doesn't matter whether the evangelist is sincere. Viewers are buying some meaning for their mundane existence. At least *some return* is guaranteed.

Thirdly, Price considers the religious thrill provided by charismatic religion. Even if the evangelist has no more spiritual concern than a secular artist bumping and grinding across the stage, the result is the same—an electric, contagious excitement. All that matters is how well the prompter has done his job.

In response to objections that it must be a superficial religion to work in this way, Price partly agrees in that he views mass market faith as a trivialization of Christianity. But, he says, people have different levels of appreciation and taste. Whether the whole thing is a scam or not, they seem to derive edification regardless. "My suspicion is that we can go no further than assessing the issues for ourselves in order to decide which form of faith we will personally accept." And responding to those who say there is only one true description of the Gospel, Price quotes H. Richard Niebuhr who observed that we are often right in what we affirm but wrong in what we deny. "We should, indeed we must, confess the faith delivered unto us, but we need not trouble ourselves one way or the other about the confessions of others."

—Elaine Tupy

BOOK REVIEWS

War, Morality and the Military Profession

Malham M. Wakin

Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 1979

COL. Malham M. Wakin is associate dean of the faculty and professor and head of the Department of Philosophy and Fine Arts at the United States Air Force Academy. He has taught philosophy and ethics to academy Cadets for more than twenty years. In addition to the book, he has authored numerous articles, a handbook on the Viet-Cong infrastructure, and co-authored a text on symbolic logic. COL Wakin is the most widely known ethicist in the military services.

Most ethicists divide their subject into two broad areas: ethical theory and normative ethics. Theoretical concepts deseribe how one "does" ethics, seeking, to clarify the reasoning process and the criteria for ethical reflection. Normative ethics focuses on concepts of "good and evil" and "right and wrong" relative to specific issues. "Professional" ethics is normative ethics, as applied to the issues of particular professions. Professional ethicists seek to clarify the norms that guide, or ought to guide, their field, whether medicine, law, military service, religious ministry, or some other profession. In recent years there has been a resurgent interest in the systematic study of professional military ethics. Wakin's book, *War, Morality and The Military Profession*, is a product of this movement, and one that will shape subsequent thought in military ethics. This anthology brings together material from well-known scholars on two major topics: military professionalism and morality and war. Wakin provides a helpful introduction to each section and article, and his own paper, "The Ethics of Leadership," is a valuable contribution.

The articles in Part One address several questions: Is the military a profession or a vocation? What are the traditional American and military values? What is the relationship between the military and its parent society? Does the climate in the military services promote ethical or unethical behavior? What are the essential ethical characteristics of military leadership? Though responses to these questions vary among the contributors, general themes are discernable. Military service is a profession or "calling," not a vocation, because it has a specialized expertise, a corporate community, a service responsibility to society, and particular ethical norms. The virtues of loyalty, obedience, selflessness, and integrity are essential if the military is to accomplish its moral function of defending

national values. Wakin asserts in his article (Chapter 13) that in the military profession incompetence amounts to unethical behavior because of the "life and death" aspects of the military mission. In tackling the sticky problem of absolutism versus "relativism," Wakin points out that absolutes do exist: "One ought always to seek to do good and avoid evil" and "One ought always to act in accordance with right reason." The specific "right" actions that these "universal obligations" generate, however, will vary according to the context of the actor. Wakin and other writers in Part One are critical of the military climate as being unethical to the extent that it rewards unethical behavior.

Part Two contains several current philosophical articles on the subject of war and morality. Collectively the articles comprise a dialogue on the principles of just-war theory and the Law of the Land Warfare. Donald Wells (Chapter 17), a pacifist, criticizes the effort morally to justify war, especially in the nuclear age. Anscombe (Chapter 19) and others justify warfare for defensive purposes if limited by moral principles (e.g. protection of noncombatants). Wasserstrom (Chapters 20 & 22) recognizes the validity of war for self defense, but criticizes the Law of the Land Warfare as being morally insufficient. Conversely, Taylor (Chapters 16, 25, & 26), who provides a brief trace of the historical development of the laws, believes that they serve a useful purpose. He and others also affirm that "following orders" is legally and morally an inadequate defense in war crimes trials. Part Two concludes with a sensitive discussion of the moral paradoxes of deterrance.

The articles in this anthology are indispensable for an adequate study of both topics, military professionalism and the morality of war. Wakin has provided a valuable service by collecting them into one publication. This book could be further strengthened by including a few of the several excellent theological articles on war and morality.

—Chaplain (MAJ) Donald L. Davidson

Understanding Catholicism

Monika K. Hellwig

Paulist Press, New York, NY 1981

200 pp. $4-95 Paper

Monika K. Hellwig is assistant professor of theology at Georgetown University, Washington, DC. She is the author of many articles and a number of books, including *Eucharist and the Hunger of the World* and *What Are They Saying About Death and Christian Hope?*

Worry about having questions regarding one's faith or about traditional explanations that seem no longer meaningful is misplaced worry. No

formulation of the Catholic faith can be *the* formulation, once and for always; there is no escaping the need for continuing reflection and attempts at understanding. Each formulation of faith's content "is more a starting point than a conclusion." This book is concerned with the kinds of "questions that deepen faith rather than destroy it," that move from past formulations to questions about their meaning "in terms of the experiences, decisions and challenges facing us today."

For Catholics, church tradition is the main source of Christian doctrine and its understanding. This tradition is a mixture of "official" resources, including "the Bible, the creeds and liturgical texts, and the conciliar, episcopal and papal teachings." There is also an "unofficial" analogue, that is, "the Christian life of the community of believers." Taken together, these represent the principal "sources for any understanding of the Catholic faith in its relevance and its exigency for our lives today. One may question the meaning of the formal teachings only in the context of the living faith community and its vast heritage of unofficial testimonies and records."

In a succession of eleven essays grouped around the main outlines of the Apostles' Creed, Hellwig explores the many-faceted tradition in relation to the central doctrines regarding God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit; sin and salvation; the Church and its sacraments; death and resurrection; eschatology; and the paradox of the Christian idea of the triune God. The historical influences that helped produce the doctrines and the meaning of the doctrines for thoughtful modern religious believers and seekers are elucidated. Each essay has a section at its conclusion called "Related Material," which is a succinct selection of bibliographical materials for further study.

—**William E. Paul, Jr.**

The Liturgical Year.

Adolf Adam.

Pueblo Publishing Company: New York, 1981.

A Translation by Matthew J. O'Connell 308 pgs.

Effective Church Planning

Lyle E. Schaller

Abingdon: Nashville, 1979, 176 pages

I chose these two books to review because the titles seemed to imply a relationship—thus a joint review. There is a relationship but on a level

much deeper than I had anticipated. Both books are about nurturing Christians within the body of Christ. *The Liturgical Year* approaches nurturing through an understanding of the Christian calendar and its application in local congregations. *Effective Church Planning* examines nurturing from the perspective of the behavioral scientist; it translates several behavioral science concepts into solving techniques for those problems which plague churches and cloud the good news.

Dr. Adam presents a scholarly highlight of the Christian calendar to "explain the present form as well as the theological and spiritual substance of the liturgical year against the background of its historical development and thereby to stimulate Christians to fruitful participation in it.... Preaching and catechesis... must endeavor... to make Christians informed interpreters of the liturgical cycle [and] helped to feel at home and secure in the church."

Concepts dealt with include the usual Christian feasts, cosmic time, ordinary time, the Jewish calendar, and the problems of a calendar in general.

I found the book to be an invaluable aid to my understanding of the Christian year and a catalyst to my determination to be more concerned than ever with the whole mystery of Christ as it unfolds in the drama of the Christian calendar festivals.

On the other hand, Dr. Schaller looks at the church and its message from another perspective, not through history or from the outside, but "identifying and analyzing some of the neglected institutional environmental factors in a congregation that tend to inhibit the personal and spiritual growth of the members and block the numerical growth of the congregation."

Some of these factors are: groups and group management, creativity, motivation, left and right hemisphere persons, the enabler. All of these concepts are approached from the case study methods and alternatives are suggested.

Both books are important to a pastor, *The Liturgical Year* for its preaching strategist's point of view and *Effective Church Planning* for its preaching technician's viewpoint. Now, all you have to do is figure out what I mean by strategist and technician. Don't get hung-up there. Just read the books.

—Chaplain (LTC) James H. McKinney

The Transforming Moment: Understanding Convictional Experiences

James E. Loder

Harper & Row, Publishers, San Francisco, CA 1981

229 pp. $12.95 Hardbound

James E. Loder is Professor in the Department of Practical Theology of Princeton Theological Seminary. He is an ordained Presbyterian minister who holds a Ph.D. from Harvard University. He took clinical training at the Massachusetts Mental Health Clinic in Boston, researched the relationship of theology and psychiatric theory at the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas, and did postdoctoral work at Piaget's Institut des Sciences de l'Education in Geneva, Switzerland. He has published numerous articles, contributed to several books on Christian education, and wrote *Religion in the Public Schools* and *Religious Pathology and Christian Faith*.

The phenomenon of renewed enthusiasm for "spiritual experience" has flourished for over a decade and continues to spread its influence in the United States and the world. As the author of this book sees it, "this flourishing of ecstasies" requires some serious examination to help those who experience such events distinguish "between subjective intoxication and the Divine Presence.... And if... Divine Presence, what then?"

Loder perceives a necessity for a new way of thinking, "informed by theological and clinical approachos [and interpreting] transforming moments in their own right. [Such] moments need to be recognized as sources of new knowledge about God, self, and the world, and as generating the quality and strength of life that can deal creatively with the sense of nothingness shrouding the extremities and pervading the mainstream of modern living." His book presents an approach to such experiences that is aimed at "bringing them into a perspective where they can be examined, unpacked and interpreted, both for insight into God's action in the world and for informing our response to what he is doing."

The author draws on Christian theology, psychology, philosophy, and learning theory to offer a model for understanding what he calls "convictional knowing" or unexpected, overpowering experiences of life-changing religious realization. The seven chapters of the study begin with an episode from Loder's own life that was such a knowing event and an examination of some of its implications. He moves on to construction of a coherent theory regarding a new approach to reality. In order for it to be "theologically and behaviorally adequate," it must be "transformational," that is, a plangent change of one's very being by God through the event must ensue; it must be "four-dimensional," involving one's worldly context one's self vis-a-vis God and others, "the void... [for which] death is the definitive metaphore," and "the Holy..., the manifest Presence of being-itself... in and through a particular context"; it must be "Christocentric," meaning "identified and governed by the Spiritual Presence of Christ"; and it must be "grounded in the, structures and dynamics of human development." This model for understanding is then organized in two sets of guidelines, one theologically oriented, the other psychologically oriented. These are for helping one to lay open, assess, and interpret the contribution that convictional experiences make to life in Christ. They include composite exemplary cases as illustrations. As Loder puts it, "These propositions thematize the impact of convicting experiences on the human personality and the personality's response to the impact in light of God's revelation in Christ."

—William E. Paul, Jr.

Teaching Christian Adults

Warren N. Wilbert

Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI 1980

234 pp. $9.95 Hardbound

Warren N. Wilbert is professor of adult continuing education and director of continuing Christian education at Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Teaching God's Word to adults involves "special requirements and considerations inherent in [all] teaching and learning at the adult level." That includes having a clear understanding of Christian adult education as being "a discrete entity," something unique and self standing. Adult programs must be viewed from the perspective of the "constituent elements [that] comprise the educational relationship... with the same critical and scholarly attention accorded [programs] on the elementary and secondary levels." This book's primary consideration is a presentation of "the art of teaching Christian adults," taking into account all of these factors.

Wilbert begins with a thorough discussion of the "contextual environment" in which teaching adult Christians occurs. It is, he notes, a "background of many complicated interrelationships," several of which he analyzes from a biblical perspective as well as in terms of adult Christian educational aims, namely, "proclamation, fellowship, and nurture." He then considers "learning at adult levels" and the goal of guiding Christian adults toward becoming "acquisitive learner[s]". Part Three concerns the teacher as "the most strategic influence at work in the teaching-learning situation." Here are "brought together the major elements of the adult Christian educational relationship in an examination of the art of teaching." The author includes practical helps along the way toward achievement of "an effective study of God's Word on the adult level through apt teaching, acquisitive learning, and a faith-filled reliance upon God's precious gifts of Word and sacrament."

Throughout the entire text various charts, figures and diagrams are employed for clarification and explanation. There are four examples of very complete and detailed lesson plans. Selected bibliographies are included at the end of each of the three principal parts of the book. Two appendices present "A Systems Design of Evaluating an Adult Education" and "A Diagnostic Instrument for the Adult Bible Class."

—William E. Paul, Jr.

In Praise of Women: A Christian Approach to Love, Marriage, and Equality

Robina and John W. Drakeford

Harper & Row, Publishors, San Francisco, CA 1980

180 pp. $8.95 Hardbound

Robina and John W. Drakeford are a married couple who share a joint ministry at the Baptist Marriage and Family Counseling Center in Fort Worth, Texas, where they also make their home. They conduct Family Enrichment Conferences in churches across the United States and in various places abroad. Mrs. Drakeford is a specialist in organizing group meetings. Her husband is Professor of Psychology and Counseling at Southwestern Baptist Seminary and the author of some 26 books, including *A Christian View of Homosexuality, Psychology in Search of a Soul, People to People Therapy*, and *Wisdom to Today's Family*. The Drakefords alos co-authored another book, *Mothers are Special.*

This book comprises a discussion, including some exegesis and interpretation, of Proverbs 31:10-31, an ancient acrostic describing the ideal wife. Dr. John Drakeford paraphrases the verses in order to have each begin with the successive letters of the Roman alphabet. In most of the 22 brief essays, Mrs. Robina Drakeford's reminiscences, points of view, exhortations, and the like, as appropriate, appear in italics; the aim is to provide "a distinctive feminine perspective to the subject" at hand.

The central figure of this Old Testament portrayal is referred to as "superwoman" thoughout the book. She may well be the imaginative creature of the mother of the acrostic's author, taught to him as he grew up. In any event, she is a remarkable subject for "the most laudatory passage about women to be found anywhere in the Old Testament."

The Drakefords "examine many of the facets that shine from this unusual jewel of a woman." Drawing on studies of "different translations, commentaries, psychological theories, and counseling cases," as well as their personal insights, they present modern Christian applications of the various ideal aspects presented in the Proverbs text. Realizing personal potential, psychological needs, the concept of partnership, hobbies, "The Homemaker Executive", the importance of keeping purposefully active, social involvement, personal "concern for others, the art of conversation, living as an example (modeling), relationships with children, values, charm and beauty, and much more all receive attention.

Mrs. Drakeford has the last word in the book. Having spent so much time with the subject, she and her husband find the ideal representative woman a permanent part of a modern "triangular relationship." She sums it up thus: "Superwife has become so much a part of our lives that I find myself telling my friends about 'the virtuous wife' of Proverbs 31 and have a feeling that anyone who has never heard about her is a traitor to the cause of women. Superwife will forever remain a proud and honored part of our home and family."

—William E. Paul, Jr

Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity

Martin Hengel

Fortress Press, Philadelphia, PA 1980

160 pp. $8.95 Hardbound

Martin Hengel is Professor of New Testament and Early Judaism at the University of Tuebingen, Germany. He is the author of a number of books, including *Judaism and Hellenism* (in two volumes); *Christ and Power*; *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*; *Property and Riches in the Early Church*; *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?*; *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion.*

The two scholarly studies in this book are described by Hengel as fragmentary and incomplete, "intended as no more than a stimulus—and for some people perhaps a stumbling block—which may prompt further reflection and study, particularly where [he departs] from the generally accepted views of New Testament scholarship." He has two main concerns, namely "to question the radical historical scepticism... so widespread in a number of areas [of contemporary] scholarship"; and second, to express his opposition to the other extreme, "the primitive ostracism of historical—and that always means critical—methods, without which neither historical nor theological understanding of the New Testament is possible." In conjunction with these concerns, he hopes his "historical and theological sketch" will prove helpful to an increased understanding of "the general background to earliest Christianity...."

Part I surveys the sources of early Christian historiography in the context of the practices and techniques, as well as the severe restrictions and problems, of general history and biography writing in antiquity. The historical narratives of the early Christian writers were not notable exceptions to the prevailing literary forms or problems. Their unique quality was simply connected to the particular claims they presented; in other respects, they were part of the contemporary literary scene. Thus the work of Luke the physician enjoys the same trustworthiness as that of other ancient historians. "We only do justice to the significance of Luke as the first theological 'historian' of Christianity if we take his work seriously as a source, i.e. if we attempt to examine it critically, reconstructing the story which he tells by adding and comparing the other sources."

Part II presents a paradigm of such critical examination and reconstruction, covering "the period between the persecution of the 'Hellenists' and the 'apostolic council', i.e. of the decisive span of about twenty-five years." This effort also reveals how much is owed to Luke "in terms of historical knowledge and understanding." Although his work cannot be used as "the basis for a continuous 'history of primitive Christianity', " it

nevertheless does provide a foundation for "a sketch of developments from the first community in Jerusalem to the world-wide mission of Paul."

Part III is a supplement to the studies and consists of "propositions concerning the problem of historical methods and the theological interpretation of the New Testament," published elsewhere at an earlier date.

—**William E.. Paul, Jr.**

The Promise and the Presence: Toward a Theology of the Kingdom of God

Isaac C. Rottenberg

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI 1980

108 pp. $4.95 Paper

Isaac C. Rottenberg is a minister of the Reformed Church in America. He has served as pastor, seminary lecturer, and denominational executive. As a writer and translator he has been published in a variety of journals and magazines.

Rottenberg points out that there is a resurgence of interest in the theme of the kingdom of God. It is, for instance, the subject of special study by the World Council of Churches; several authors in the evangelical tradition are underscoring the centrality of its significance to the biblical witness; and Catholic theologians, spurred on by developments initiated at Vatican II, are more and more oriented to the kingdom in their approach. This book is the result of theological reflection "on the vision of the coming kingdom" and on "the concept of 'kingdom theology.' "

He finds that the Bible's influence on people is quite specific: "...it confronts them with the Word of promise, recreates them into a people of hope, and sends them on their way into history." The term that best expresses the many-faceted approach of God in his dealings with the world *and* "the unity of the biblical vision concerning God's future" is the "gospel of the kingdom." Throughout the Bible readers find a "God of Promise" who challenges them with his kingdom and its claim, a kingdom established in their midst by the power of the Spirit. In this way "the future of the Lord is manifested among us."

The kingdom does not lend itself to concise description; it is full of paradoxes in the biblical record, yet these manage somehow to help its nature and relevance to be understood. Its present reality as well as its element of promise need to be grasped before participation in it can really begin. Experiences of repentance, a childlike faith, conversion, rebirth are also necessary. The redemptive presence of God in the world, as "a foretaste of the future," makes the future, not the past, "the formative power in the historical process." This "God who comes" is revealed most completely in Jesus Christ; the events of Jesus' life, from the Incarnation to the

expected Parousia, "are moments in the coming of the kingdom." In the historical period between the "already" and the "not yet," the Holy Spirit guarantees the promised inheritance, and preserves, guides and prepares Christian believers until they obtain full possession of it. The church's eschatological perspective must be kept in balance between God's presence and his promise. The lessons of history lead to the conclusion that any new quest for a kingdom theology must not eccleiasticize it, nor secularize it, nor produce an individual spirituality that is exclusively either other-worldly or this-worldly. Christian mission must be viewed in the context of the kingdom of God, understanding "both the Church and the world... from the perspective of the future of the Lord"; mission "must be seen in the light of God's historical-eschatological dealings with the world." It is a mission of proclamation of the Christian message, service to the kingdom (*diakonia* in its many forms), possible suffering for a Christian stance, and" [prayer] for the kingdom because we have experienced the power of the new age."

—William E. Paul, Jr.

The End of Christendom

Malcolm Muggeridge

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI 1980

62 pp. $2.50 Paper

Malcolm Muggeridge now 78 years of age, has been a teacher, soldier, foreign correspondent, columnist, magazine editor, radio and television commentator, lecturer, and author of more than fifteen titles, including *Christ and the Media, Jesus Rediscovered, Jesus: The Man Who Lives, A Third Testament*, and *A Twentieth Century Testimony*.

This little volume contains the inaugural addresses of the Pascal Lectures on Christianity and the University, given at the University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, in October 1978. The lectures are incorporated into two essays, "The End of Christendom" and "But Not of Christ."

The initial essay begins with an appreciative review of Blaise Pascal's use of words, his mental lucidity, his learning, his Christian faith as these are reflected in his writings. Muggeridge finds in the work of Pascal, as well as that of William Blake and Dostoevski, illustrations of God's use of history, which really consist of parables that communicate in terms of imagination and faith rather than in terms of intellect and knowledge. The key to decoding the messages of these parables of God, encoded in history and in nature, lies in the Incarnation, through which we are enabled to understand what they say.

"With that as background, the subject of the essay—based on a

remark by Archbishop Fulton Sheen that "Christendom is over"—is addressed. Christendom, of course, is not Christianity; It is "the administrative or power structure, based on the Christian religion and constructed by men." Christ founded Christianity, which began with the Incarnation; the Emperor Constantine founded Western Christendom when, in the fourth century, he "united [the Church] to the secular state by the closest possible ties." The decline and imminent fall of Western Christendom in our time is due to a number of contributory factors, including "what we call liberalism," cultural decline, "the abandonment of Christian mores, " the "quest for security and plenty," and scientific achievements that lead to "a growing arrogance, a widening separation from the true nature of our being; in other words, an alienation from God."

The second essay addresses the question of Christ's situation "in the shambles of a collapsed Christendom." Overall, says the author, Jesus' kingdom remains; indeed, it stands out "more clearly and [can be] appreciated more sharply by contrast with the darkness and depravity of the contemporary scene." For instance, the failure of the Soviets to eradicate the Christian faith in favor of overt atheism and materialism in their system offers "a wonderful sign..., the amazing renewal of the Christian faith in its purest possible form in [Russia]." Indeed, "the best example of the incarnate presence of Christ to withstand worldly power is [Alexander] Solzhenitsyn." In his writings and speeches he decries Marxism and proclaims that Christianity is the single "living spiritual force" capable of effecting "the spiritual healing of Russia." In precisely the same way the Incarnation—"God's special parable for fallen man in a fallen world" —"transforms human life and the entire "cosmic scene" and the Christian revolation remains supportively and salvifically true amid the decay of Christendom.

—William E. Paul, Jr.

The Bio-Sexual Factor

Richard Hagen

Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1979.

This popularly written, social-psychology book is *must* reading for chaplains, in my opinion, especially for our female chaplains, because Hagen has rendered both sexes an incalculable service by marshalling extensive research results and joining to them his (and others') interpretations about theory and practice.

Having chucked a Fundamentalist religious background, by and large, in exchange for a new sort of an agnostic religious theism, Hagen writes with clarity, profound insight, and lightly pressured persuasiveness.

He adds for his readers an extensive bibliography of eleven pages and a fine index of ten.

Subtlety is *not* a charge that can be leveled against Richard Hagen. His initial chapter, "We've All Been Hurt," concludes with a call for both sexes to be realistic. His realism will definitely anger some of the more radical feminists when he declares: "You are a woman and I am a man. We are biologically different."

He writes this in the face of a raging controversy which says on the one hand that *all differences between males and females are sociologically acquired*, but on the other hand that *the most basic differences are physiologically determined before birth.*

Hagen adopts the latter and seeks to set forth hard research data to support it.

For heuristic purposes, he adopts an evolutionary model of human development in order to set forth his understanding of the research data, even though at the conclusion of the book he confesses:

> Although I have now written several hundred pages based on the assumptions of evolution, my personal beliefs are in some ways quite discrepant with those of most evolutionists. My sense of logic makes me very skeptical about the possibility that life could have ever "happened" or that the magnificent complexity of any living organism could have come about purely as the result of a series of accidents.

Then he lists what he sees to be the improbabilities of evolutionary arrival of the species without a "Creator-designer." He opts for an alternate position, which he confesses is also a great leap of faith and which "I've chosen—for reasons I probably don't fully comprehend."

Reading this book will at times make one laugh, at other times bring tears of concern, and at still others make one want to suspend judgment until more data are gathered. In the end, this book will make the reader *think* soberly, so much so that one might even be led to alter certain positions taken over the years by osmosis rather being based on hard data.

—Robert H. Countess

Time Management
(A working guide for church leaders)

Speed B. Leas

This book is published (fifth printing 1981) by the Abingdon Press as part of the Creative Leadership Series edited by Lyle E. Schaller.

Speed B. Leas is on the adjunct staff of the Alban Institute, Washington, D.C. He is co-author of *Church Fights: Managing Conflicts in the Local Church*, and is widely known as a church consultant.

Here is an excellent little book for any clergy person who has yearned for time—more or less. Speed Leas offers help to those of us who, for several reasons, believe we do not have enough time, and to some of the rest of us for whom time "hangs heavy." In either case, the author contends that time is not the problem. And the reason is that, no matter what the title of the book suggests, time simply cannot be managed. Our task, rather, is to manage ourselves in the context of time.

With this as its basic theme, the book is organized to address the self management problems faced by the clergy person who is (1) a compulsive worker, (2) a procrastinator, (3) experiencing role conflict, or (4) in a situation where he/she does not have enough to do. There is also a chapter in which the author describes approximately eighteen laborsaving techniques and devices for ministers.

The author addresses each problem area of self management by describing the symptoms, analyzing the causal factors, and offering practical suggestions to deal with the problem. His insights are convincing, inasmuch as he writes with the combined credibility of researcher and parish pastor.

It is as a researcher that he identifies the most common self management problem among the clergy to be that of compulsive work. He says that the clergy forget that there is no relation between the amount of time and effort that go into our work and the quality of that work. He says that the clergy's inclination to measure our worth in terms of the intensity and hours we invest in our work is due, in large measure, to the absence of tangible products and commensurate salary.

What Speed Leas offers as a remedy for this and other self management problems is what we chaplains call MBOR: Management By Objectives for Results. The term itself is never used in this book, but the concept is presented in a helpful, convincing manner.

This is a book for every chaplain. To read it is not necessarily an admission of having a self management problem. Even if you do, but won't admit it, you can profess to be interested in Speed Leas' laborsaving techniques.

—Chaplain (MAJ) Thomas M. Warme

INDEX

The following index of the Military Chaplains' Review includes all entries from Vol. 1, No. 1 through DA Pam 165-132 (Winter 1982). Issues published in 1972 and 1973 were designated by volume and number. Since 1974, they have been numbered sequentially as the DA Pamphlet 165 series. References cited are by volume, number, and page, or by DA Pam number and page. For example, "V1, N2, 43" indicates "Volume 1, Number 2, page 43," while "118, 33" indicates PA Pamphlet 165-118, page 33." The designation al. indicates the entire issue. (This index is updated annually in each Spring edition.)

AUTHOR INDEX

Ackermann, Ch. Henry F. 118, 53
Adams, Doug 121, 23
Adickes, Ch. Donald K. 119, 13
Alexander, Ch. George W. V2, N3, 45
Alexander, Ch. Harold L. 114, 1
123, 87
Allen, Ch. Eugene E. 109, 17
111, 53
127, 1
Ammerman, Ch. E.H. 113, 91
Anderson, Ch. Allister C. V1, N2, 31
Atwood, Dr. Bertram DeH. 111, 65
Autry, Ch. Jerry D. 105, 18

Bagnal, Ch. William, K., Jr. 125, 42
Baily, BG Mildred C. 106, 45
Baker, MG George I. 115, 47
Balog, Cecilia 125, 70
Bankson, Majory Zoet 121, 31
Barber, LTC Don W. 120, 107
Barnard, Ch. Robert S., Jr. 128, 51
Barnhouse, Rev. Ruth Tiffany 127, 11
Baroni, Msgr. Gene C. V1, N4, 20
Bass, Ch. Charles D. V2, N4, 19
Bazyn, Ken 124, 59
Beal, Ch. Donald B. 125, 53
Bell, Ch. Arthur F. V2, N4, 19
Bellwood, Dr. Lester R. V2, N4, 10
Berger, Dr. Peter 112, 79
Bertocci, Dr. Peter A. 110, 20
Bezanson, Ch. Ronald S., Jr. 131, 47
Bichsel, Dr. Alfred M. 100, 47
Bickley, Ch. Hugh J. 103, 38
Biersdorf, Dr. John E. 107, 43
Blustein, Ch. Alan M. 116, 74
Bonacci, Gwendolyn A. 122, 87
Bonnot, Ch. Bernard R. 117, 1
Bowker, Ch. Gary A. 132, 63
Boyce, Ch. David G. 107, 27
110, 1
116, 1
Brallier, Lynn W. 127, 91
Brandt, Ch. Richard A. 120, 113
Braswell, Dr. George W., Jr. 125, 19
Braun, MAJ Bennett G. V2, N4, 10
Brayer, Dr. Menachem M. 119, 57
Breland, Ch. Don C. 120, 59
Brewer, Dr. Earl D.C. 116, 59

Brinsfield, Ch. John W.	102, 35
	126, 45
Brizee, MAJ Harold R.	108, 75
Brooks, COL Leo A.	115, 19
Brooks, Ch. Porter H.	V2, N2, 9
Brower, William	121, 51
Brown, Ch. Allen, Jr.	108, 61
Brown, Gretchen	125, 73
Browne, Ch. Clinton E.	110, 51
Brummitt, Ch. Malcolm J.	117, 79
	124, 23
Burke, Dr. John	101, 7
Burttram, Ch. Danny W.	104, 43
Calian, Dr. Carnegie Samual	114, 95
Capitani, Ch. Anthony L.	V1, N2, 19
Carmichael, Ch. G. Mixon	123, 17
Carroll, LCDR Vincent, CHC	128, 81
Casdorph, Dr. H. Richard	113, 63
Chase, Ch. Allen P.	130, 61
Clinebell, Dr. Howard J., Jr.	V1, N3, 1
Cobb, Ch. Ronald Lee	120, 37
Confroy, Ch. Thomas J.	123, 47
Conrad, Ch. Michael F.	119, 37
	129, 67
Cornish, Edward	130, 87
Costello, Gwen	119, 95
Costello, Richard	119, 95
Coulter, Ch. David C.	109, 93
Countes, Ch. Robert H.	111, 29
Covert, Mr. Norman M.	115, 31
Cowan, Ch. Emory G., Jr.	129, 79
Cox, Mrs. Delle	106, 54
Creighton, BG Neal	125, 33
Creswell, Ch. Carl E.	128, 7
Crick, Ch. Robert D.	V1, N2, 53
	113, 97
Curry, BG Jerry R.	113, 55
Danielson, Ch. Wendell E.	126, 15
Daughton, Ms. Sandy	106, 33
Davidson, Ch. Neal R.	102, 11
David, Ch. Donald R.	118, 85
David, LTC James R.	120, 83
	126, 89
	130, 81
David, Susan	120, 83
Davies, Ch. Richard E.	117, 23
Davis, Dr. C. Anne	106, 77
Davis, Ch. Donald R.	114, 49
Davis, Ch. Edwin S.	124, 69
Deal, Ch. Thomas L.	113, 23
DeLeo, Ch. William J.	128, 99
DeVeaux, Ch. John A., Jr.	V1, N1, 19
Dobson, Dr. James C.	123, 41
Doyle, Ruth T.	131, 31
Dozier, Verna J.	131, 17
Dresin, Ch. Sanford L.	123, 51
Dryer, Ch. Richard E.	125, 51
Duncan, Ch. Gregory L.	129, 73
Duggan, Rev. Robert D.	127, 83
Dulaney, Ch. Joseph P.	108, 32
Dunaway, Ch. William C.	117, 59
Duncan, Sister Rosemary	116, 49

Duncan, Mr. Tommie L. V1, N2, 7
Dunn, Ch. Roger T. 125, 62
Durbin, Ch. Paul G. 132, 29
Dwyer, Rev. Vincent 127, 67
Dyba, Ch. Anthony 118, 59

Eakin, Ms. Joann N. 110, 92
Edmonson, Ch. James H. 108, 46
Edwards, Dr. Herbert O. 110, 41
Elliot, Dr. Albert R. 121, 42
Elster, Ch. Sheldon E. 126, 35
Ettershank, Ch. John P. 125, 31
Evans, Ms. Norene R. 115, 61

Fant, Dr. Clyde E. 101, 15
Farra, Robert R. 130, 81
Farrell, Ch. Larry D. 125, 56
Fedder, Norman J. 121, 71
Fernlund, Ch. Calvin E. 105, 27
Fichter, Rev. Joseph H. 112, 39
Finney, Ch. Hershel M., Jr. 122, 55
Fischer, Dr. Clare B. 106,55
110, 92
Fitzgerald, Rev. O. Ray 127, 99
Fletcher, Dr. John C. 102, 1
Flower, Ch. Edward E., Jr. V2, N4, 41
Foreman, Mrs. Elaine W. 111, 15
Freyholtz, Jerry 125, 66
Frazier, Ch. Joseph R. 132, 99
Friensen, Ch. Eugene W. 108, 23
Frimoth, Rev. Bud 129, 101
Furgeson, Dr. Earl H. V1, N3, 53
Futernick, MAJ Allan J. 122, 1

Galbraith, Ch. Hemming L. 128, 51
Galle, Ch. Joseph E., III V2, N4, 60
102, 26
111,1
118,11
Galloway, COL Katherine F. 115, 41
Garrigan, CPT James J. 123, 17
Garrison, Ch. Raymond A. 108, 15
Gasparovic, Ch. Eugene C. 131, 53
Gatti, Rev. Daniel J. 109, 52
Gibbs, MSG Lester B. 121, 57
Gilbert, Ch. Bertram C. V1, N2, 48
V2, N1, 38
Gillespie, Dr. Joanna Bowen 123, 35
Githens, CDR William H. 128, 81
Gnewach, Ch. Donald E. 109, 65
Grenz, Ch. Clinton E. V1, N3, 31
Greve, Ch. Lionel 132, 53
Gribbon, Rev. Robert T. 129, 9
Groen, Ch. Douglas J. V1, N2, 53
Grollman, Dr. Earl A. 109, 33
G'Segner, Ch. Ford F. 107, 43
Gushwa, Ch. Robert L. 128, 91

Haines, GEN Ralph E., Jr. 113, 11
Hambrick, Ch. David C., Jr. 113, 83
Hannah, Ch. John R. 125, 54
Hanner, Pats H. 121, 47
Harayda, Janice 119, 47
Harms, Rev. William C. 131, 39
Harris, Ch. Thomas A. V1, N2, 1
V1, N3, 21

Hatfield, Hon. Mark O. 127, 23
Hedrick, Ch. Charles W. 120, 1
132, 23
Henderson, Dr. J. Frank 115, 75
Herrera, Dr. Marina 119, 73
Hess, Ch. Robert S. 104, 13
Hester, Dr. Richard L. 114, 21
Hicks, Ch. H. Harrell 112, 25
Hicks, Rev. Richard 130, 41
Hill, Ch. Thomas M. 112, 65
Hogan, Dr. Robert 100, 38
Hoogland, Mrs. Alma L. V2, N4, 29
Horton, Ch. Janet 128, 27
Hughes, Ch. William J. 118, 97
123, 25
Hulme, Ch. John W. V1, N4, 52
Hutlberg, Ch. William J. 128, 73
Hutcheson, Dr. Richard G. 110, 77
Hyatt, Ch. Gerhardt W. V2, N2, 1
105, 1
Irwin, SP4 Edwin F. 115, 11
Jackson, Dr. B.F. 107, 7
Jackson, Dr. Douglas E. V1, N4, 1
Jacobs, Rev. William E. 130, 37
Jaeger, Ch. James 109, 43
Jampolsky, Dr. Gerald G. 127, 75
Jensen, Dr. Richard A. 113, 1
Johnson, Ch. Kermit D. 125, 1
131, 1
Johnson, Ch. Richard A. 109, 99
Johnson, Ch. Richard H. 117, 35
Johnson, Ch. Roger W. 131, 63
Johnson, Dr. Vernon E. 112, 31
Jones, Ch. Emlyn H. 131, 97
Jones, Dr. Joyce C. 103, 52
Jones, Thomas A. 129, 87
Kapusta, Ch. Emil F. V1, N4, 47
Kelly, Ch. Colin P. 118, 21
Kildahl, Dr. John P. 113, 35
Killinger, Dr. John 107, 1
110, 61
124, 7
Kim, Ch. Stephen K. 126, 83
Kindsratter, CPT Peter S. 126, 9
King, Ch. Carl S. 104, 35
King, Ch. Wayne C. 118, 45
Kinlaw, Ch. Dennis C. 107, 63
Kissel, Dr. Stanley 123, 7
Kohl, Ch. John P. 124, 13
Kratz, Allen W. 129, 21
Kroeger, Otto 132, 111
Lacey, Ch. Floyd E. 129, 93
Lamm, Rabbi Maurice 127, 59
Lapp, Ch. Ernest D. V2, N2, 42
Leroe, Ch. Robert G. 122, 69
Levine, Rabbi Joseph 124, 77
Lewis, Ch. Cecil D. 131, 7
Libby, Ch. Billy W. 125, 39
Lifton, Dr. Robert Jay 116, 15
Lindsey, Ch. Chester R. V1, N2, 43
Little, Dr. David 100, 1

Little, Dr. Sara 119, 27
Lobo, Rev. Anthony F. 117, 41
Lorentz, David 125, 39

Mace, Dr. David 123, 71
MacIndoe, COL John W. 115, 69
Madus, Ch. Peter 132, 41
Maher, CPT Edward R. 126, 9
Mallard, Ch. Charles E. 122, 19
129, 1
Marthaler, Dr. Berard L. 119, 83
Martin, CDR H. Lawrence, CHC 128, 33
Martin, Ch. William A. 131, 109
122, 81
Mathis, Ch. Roy N. 118,89
Matthias, Nancy 125, 66
McClintock, Rev. Ross S. 130, 17
McCracken, Samuel 122, 43
McCubbin, Dr. Hamilton I. 124, 49
130, 97
McCullough, Ch. Mark M. 120, 19
122, 75
McMillan, Ch. Whitfield H. 128, 1
McSwain, Ch. Donald W. V2, N3, 13
Mehl, Dr. Duane P. 112, 51
Meyers, Ch. Glenn L. 128, 63
Mill, Dr. Cyril R. V2, N1, 22
Miller, Sr. Janet 119, 19
Mitchell, Dr. Henry H. V1, N1, 1
Mitchell, Dr. Kenneth R. 109, 23
Mole, Ch. Robert L. V2, N2, 9
Moon, Harriet Faye 122, 87
Moore, Ch. Lowell P. 125, 53
Moore, Bishop Paul, Jr. 116, 37
Morelli, COL Donald R. 115, 25
Morris, Dr. George E. 130, 23
Mulder, Dr. John M. 111, 35

Nagata, Frances 123, 79
Nagata, William 123, 79
Nelson, Ch. O.D. 127, 111
Neshiem, Ch. Vaughn R. 107, 31
Nichols, Dr. J. Randall 101, 23
Noble, Ch. William C. 112, 21
132, 1
Nolte, Ch. David M. 125, 53
Northup, Ch. Lesley A. 132, 73
Nuscher, Ch. Max E. 117, 93

Oates, Dr. Wayne E. 127, 47
Oden, Dr. Thomas C. 127, 29
O'Laughlin, Ch. Stanley, Jr. 108, 75
Ortegel, Sr. Adelaide 121, 63

Park, Ch. Richard L. 132, 15
Parker, Dr. James H. 114, 39
Parker, Mr. Thomas O. 103, 8
Patterson, Joan M. 130, 97
Paulson, CPT Gordon E., CHC 129, 29
Pearce, Ch. Arthur J. V2, N2, 35
122, 63

Pearson, Ch. John C. 104, 23
118, 77
Pearson, Ch. Robert L. 118, 27
Peck, Dr. Robert F. V2, N2, 30
Pendergraff, Ch. Isaac B. 109, 38
Peterson, Dr. William F. 126, 69
Pfaff, Ch. Richard A. 118, 65
Phelps, Ch. Paul E. 108, 69
Pierotti, Rev. Daniel L. V1, N4, 33
Poage, Ch. Ben 108, 55
Pohl, Mr. Frederik 110, 8
Pohlman, Ch. F. Diana 106, 20
Polhemus, Ch. David W. V2, N2, 37
Pratt, Ch. Glenn R. 102, 46
109, 53

Raines, Dr. John C. 111, 21
Ramsey, Dr. Paul V2, N1, 8
Randles, Ch. Jack C. 128, 115
Randolph, Dr. David J. 101, 32
Rasmussen, Ch. John A. 114, 79
Ratliff, Bascom W. 122, 87
Ray, Dr. Oakley S. 101, 44
Reed, Ch. John H. V2, N3, 1
Ricciuti, Rev. Gail A. 106, 10
Rice, Dr. Charles 120, 11
Richardson, Ch. Frank D. 107, 53
108, 1
111, 45
120, 75
Riches, Ch. Jon M. 122, 29
Ringstrom, Wilma Douglas 121, 85
Rivers, Rev. Clarence J. V1, N1, 43
103, 18
Roat, Ch. Stanley G. 114, 33
Roberson, Ch. Henry P. 114, 71
Robert, Ch. Archie T. 105, 58
Robinson, Ch. James C. 114, 59
Rogers, GEN Bernard W. 115, 1
Rogers, Ch. Melvin L. 120, 47
Rooks, Dr. Charles S. V2, N2, 20
Rosenbluh, Mr. Harry G. 115, 53
Rowman, Ch. Joseph C. 125, 47
Russell, Dr. Letty M. 106, 1

Sandrow, Dr. Edward T. 105,47
Sanford, Ch. Gary T. 129, 53
Sauer, Ch. John A. 126, 111
Saunders, Ch. Robert E. 117, 53
Scanlan, Rev. Michael 113, 47
Schall, Rev. James V. 116, 97
Scharlemann, Dr. Martin H. 128,, 17
Schimek, Ch. Dennis E. 130, 71
Schreck, Ch. Thomas 117, 69
126, 21
Schuckit, Dr. Marc A. 112, 9
Schumacher, Ch. John W. 111, 45
Schweitzer, Ch. Gordon M. 105, 22
Scott, Dr. Manuel L. 101, 1
Seidel, Ch. Andrew B. 130, 49
Self, Norman D. 131, 109
Sensenbrenner, Ch. Edward W. 105, 29

Severson, William Conrad 121, 9
Shaffer, Floyd T. 121, 15
Shannon, Ch. Sylvester L. V1, N1, 51
Shaughnessy, John J. 130, 9
Shaw, Ch. James E. 125, 37
Shinn, Dr. Roger L. 100, 67
Shipe, Ch. Ernest M. 122, 9
Shockley, Dr. Grant S. V1, N2, 13
116, 27
Short, Robert 129, 41
Shultz, John 125, 66
Sixty, CPT Gordon W. 102, 21
Slenk, Dr. Howard J. 103, 1
Slife, Dr. William F. 132, 85
Smith, Ch. Benjamin E. V1, N3, 13
Smith, Mr. Martin L. 110, 86
Smith, Ch. Thomas R. 123, 59
Smith, Ch. Wilford E. V2, N1, 54
102, 39
110, 28
Snyder, Ch. Maria J. 129, 61
Snyder, COL Quay C. 115, 5
Speitel, Ch. Edmond J. 111, 7
114, 7
Spradling, Grant 121, 1
Stake, Ch. John K. 131, 75
Standley, Ch. Meredith R. V2, N2, 30
Staudt, The Hon. Herman R. 104, 1
Stenbakken, Ch. Richard O. 124, 37
Stephens, Ch. Carl R. V2, N3, 27
V2, N4, 1
117, 17
120, 29
Stephenson, Ch. Douglas R. 125, 66
Stinnette, Dr. Charles R. V1, N3, 35
Stotsenburg, Ruth 125, 66
Stott, CDR Albert W., CHC 129, 29
Sweetser, Rev. Thomas P. 131, 85
Swyter, Ms. Jai 109, 1

Tatum, Ch. Timothy C. 116, 89
Terpening, SFC Daniel L. 132, 63
Thomas, Rev. George B. 119, 67
Thompson, Ch. Harold D. 124, 95
Travis, Ch. James L., III 126, 61
Troeger, Dr. Thomas H. 126, 1
Tupy, Ch. Richard R. 124, 29
129, 1
131, 23
Twynham, Mr. Robert 103, 25
Tyson, Ch. Charles A. 128, 107

Ufema, Ms. Joy 109, 9

Vanderburgh, Ch. Daryl C. 125, 45
Vaughan, Ch. Curry N., Jr. 113, 75
131, 101
Veitengruber, Ch. Donald P. 124, 85
Vernon, Dr. Glenn M. 109, 73

Waldrop, Marguerite I. 119, 19

Walker, Mary Lu	121, 79
Warme, Ch. Thomas M.	104, 9
	105, 35
Weber, Dr. Theodore R.	100, 17
Weisenbach, Rev. William	124, 1
Welsh, Ch. Donald H.	109, 85
Wessman, Meredyth J.	131, 85
Westfield, Ch. Arnold D.	118, 37
White, Ch. Phil	120, 67
Wichmanowski, Ch. Walter F.	125, 13
Wicker, Ch. R. Fenton, Jr.	V2, N4, 48
Wilke, Dr. Harold H.	V1, N4, 24
Williams, Ruth Baja	125, 63
Witmer, Ch. Charles Daniel	120, 95
Woehr, Ch. David J.	125, 59
Wolfe, Ch. Charles	122, 37
Wright, Ch. Wendell T.	V2, N1, 31
	107, 96
	116, 7
Wyckoff, Dr. D. Campbell	119, 1
Zappone, Katherine	119, 105
Zerof, Dr. Herbert G.	123, 1
Zylman, Mr. Richard	112, 1

SUBJECT INDEX

ALCOHOL (see Drug and Alcohol)	
ART	
Popular Arts and Bible	129, 41
Theology and	121, *al*
ASIANS (see also KOREA)	126, 83
Ministry to	
AUDIO VISUALS (see also MASS MEDIA):	
Use of by Chaplain	107, 27
BLACK MUSLIMS:	
And the Chaplain	V2, N3, 35
CHAPEL ACTIVITIES SPECIALISTS	132, 63
CHAPLAIN (see also RESERVE CHAPLAIN):	
Administrative	105, 27
Battalion	131, 75
Blacks and	V1, N1, *al*
	V2, N2, 20
	V2, N3, 35
Challenge of	115, 1
Changing Concept of	V2, N1, 22
Charismatic	113, 23
Chief of	118, 1
Circuit Rider	118, 59
Clinical Theologian	105, 35
Collegiality	107, 63
	102, 26
Community	125, 42
Consultation and	108, 23
Corps, Staff	125, 37
Credibility	107, 7

Division, Staff 125, 39
Expectations of 104, 9
115, *al*
Faith of 105, 1
History V2, N1, 38
V2, N2, 42
102, 35
Hospital 105, 52
118, 77
124, 77
132, 29
Industrial V1, N3, 31
115, 19
In modern fiction 122, 29
Isolated assignments and 118,11
118, 85
Jewish History of V2, N2, 42
Look at 105, 6
Moral Role of 117, 1
Pastor V2, N2, 1
105, 22
Prophetic Ministry 120, 19
120, 29
Role of V1, N3, 21
Scrupulous Penitent 132, 41
Service School and 105, 18
Special Ministries of 118, *al*
USAREUR, Staff 125, 31
Woman 128, 27
Writing 122, 75
128, 63

CHARISMATICS:
"The Charismatics" 113, *al*

CHILDREN (see also YOUTH):
Abuse of 118, 97
Death and 109, 33
109, 43
Exceptional 118, 27
Mobility and 111, 15
Parental Stress 130, 81
Sibling Rivalry 123, 41

CIVIL ACTION, DOMESTIC 108, 55

CLINICAL PASTORAL EDUCATION:
Army Health Care and V2, N3, 27
115, 47
"In Search of Faith alive" 126, 69
Jewish view of 114, 89
"Parable of C.P. Evans" 114, 1
Philosophy and Experience V1, N2, 31
Phychologist as Consultant 102, 21

COFFEEHOUSE MINISTRY 129, 73

COMBAT MINISTRY 129, 79

CONFINEMENT (see PRISON)

COUNSELING:
- Alcoholics — 112, *al*
- Amputee — V2, N3, 13
- Bible Stories and — 114, 33
- Contemporary Media and — 107, 31
- Counselor as Strategist — 122, 19
- Covenant Groups — 117, 69
- Dissatisfied Soldiers — 124, 13
- Dying — V2, N4, 1; 109, *al*
- Family — 122, 55
- Grief — 104, 43
- Guidelines — V2, N4, 48
- In AIT units — 128, 99
- Marginal Soldier — V2, N3, 1
- "Messy" Lives — 120, 75
- Peer Help — 120, 113
- Privileged Communication — 120. 67; 128, 7
- "Recovering Lost Identity" — 127, 23 & 29
- Stress — 126, 73
- Rational — 114, 49; 118, 85
- Suicide Potentials — 122, 69
- "Temple Walking" — 114, 59

DEATH AND DYING:
- Chaplain and Cancer — 130, 71
- Cautions in Discussing — 117, 59
- Death and Children — 109, 33; 109, 43
- "Death and Dying" — 109, *al*
- Dying, counseling of — V2, N4, 1
- Grief — 104, 43
- Lay ministry to survivors — 125, 13

DOMESTIC CRISES — 105, 58

DRAMA
- Clown Ministry — 121, 15
- Jewish Theater — 121, 71
- Puppetry — 121, 63
- Renewed interest in — 121, 85

DRUG AND ALCOHOL:
- "Alcohol Abuse" — 112, *al*
- Counseling — V1, N2, 19; 128, 73
- Ministry — V1, N3, 13
- "People Helping People" — V2, N4, 10
- Problems — V1, N2, 7
- Prevention — 108, 61
- Psychiatric Traits — V1, N2, 19

EDUCATION (See also RELIGIOUS EDUCATION and VALUE EDUCATION):

Future of	110, 51
Mobility and	111, 15
EQUAL RIGHTS (see HUMAN POTENTIAL)	
ETHICS:	
American	110, 20
Avoiding Armageddon	122, 1
Barth, Karl	120, 47
Bioethics	126, 61
Conscientious Objection	V2, N1, 54
	108, 38
Contract	124, 23
"Ethics"	100, *al*
Hospital	114, 79
Instructor's View of	126, 45
Judeo-Christian	104, 13
Kohlberg, Lawrence	119, 105
Military Service	V2, N1, 8
Moral Role	117, 1
Reasonable	117, 79
EUROPE	
Ministry in	125, 31-74
FAMILY (see also CHILDREN):	
Boundary Relations	126, 101
Counseling	122, 55
Death in	109, 43
	109, 93
Divorce	126, 111
Family Life Centers	130, 97
Husband/Wife Relationship	128, 107
Individualistic or Synergistic	126, 89
Home	130, 87
Marital Sexuality	120, 83
Marriage Preparation	111, 45
Ministry to	123, *al*
	125, 45
Parental Stress	130, 81
Romance to Commitment	124, 59
Separation and Reunion	124, 49
FILMS:	
"Functional Film Fare"	128, 91
FUNERALS	V2, N2, 9
FUTURE:	
Future Ministries	116, *al*
Horizons	110, *al*
HANDICAP:	
Deaf	118, 65
Exceptional Child	118, 27
HEALING (see also CHARISMATICS):	
Advocacy in	116, 15
Pastoral Role in	105, 52
	114, 79

	115, 41
	115, 47
Theme of Spiritual Journey	127, 91
Wholistic Health	127, 99
HISPANIC:	
In Church	119, 73
HISTORY	
Church and Roman Military	117, 23
Continuing Revolution	111, 35
Douglas MacArthur	124, 69
Jewish Chaplain	V2, N2, 42
Nonviolence in	110, 86
Parish Development	131, 7
Race Relations	V2, N4, 19
HOLISTIC MINISTRY	132, 29
HUMAN POTENTIAL:	
Human Potential	106, *al*
Liberation at home	111, 1
Women's Liberation	V2, N4, 29
HUMAN RELATIONS:	
Asian Wives	108, 1
Future of	110, 41
History	V2, N4, 19
KoreanAmerican Marriages	122, 87
Peacemaking	131, 23
Pluralism	116, 27
Racial Awareness	104, 35
Racism	V2, N3, 45
Trans. Analysis	V2, N4, 41
HUMAN SELF DEVELOPMENT:	
Communication in	107, 53
Model of	V1, N2, 53
Programs	108, 69
	V1, N2, 49
Values Clarification in	107, 48
ISLAM:	
Iran and	125, 19
KOREA:	
Asian American Marriages	126, 83
KoreanAmerican Marriages	122, 87
Korean Connection	118, 11
Survey of Korean-American Marriages	128, 51
LAITY:	
Assistance in Ministry	122, 63
Views From the Laity	115, *al*
LEISURE:	
Reflections on	121, 41
LITERATURE:	
Benefits of Poetry	121, 51

Chaplains in Fiction	122, 29
Novels for the Pastor	124, 7
LITURGY:	
Hymnody	132, 73
Kiss of Peace	114, 7
Last Rites (interdenominational)	132, 23
Music as	103, 1
Search for Personal	111, 7
Spirituality and	127, 83
MANAGEMENT:	
Administration	105, 27
Communication in	107, 69
Data Gathering	131, 31
Of Intangibles	104, 1
MBOR	131, 47
	131, 53
Ministry of	120, 59
Parish Development	131, *al*
Peacemaking	131, 23
Planning	131, 39
MARRIAGE (see FAMILY)	
MASS MEDIA (see also AUDIO VISUAL):	
Opportunity of	118, 53
MILITARY:	
Alcohol and	112, *al*
Charismatics and	113, *al*
Death and	109, *al*
Draft	114, 71
Early Church and	117, 23
Fraternization Policy	122, 81
Individual Replacement Policy	126, 9 & 15
MUSIC:	
Aid to Worship	121, 57
Exclusive Language in Hymnal	132, 73
Ministry of Music	103, *al*
Musical Mortar	121, 79
MUSLIM SERVICEMEN	108, 32
ORGANIZATIONS:	
Ministry to Systems	117, 9
Prophetic Ministry	120, 19
	120, 29
PARISH COUNCIL:	
Design	124, 29
Untapped Power	115, 25
PARISH DEVELOPMENT	131, *al*
Implications for Soldier Ministry	129, 67
PREACHING:	
Beginnings	V2, N1, 1
Black	V1, N1, 1

Chaplain	117, 93
Comes Alive	117, 85
Critique of	115, 61
	115, 75
Excellence in	120, 1
Homiletics	101, *al*
Imagination in	V2, N4, 60
Innovative	102, 11
Insights for	122, 37
Language of	107, 13
Memorable	130, 9
Multi Cultural	130, 23
Parable of	114, 1
Today	V1, N3, 53
	120, 11
What Shall I Preach . . .	126, 1
PRISON	108, 75
	118, 45
	132, 15
PROMOTION PASSOVER	117, 35
	128, 45
PSYCHOLOGY (see also COUNSELING and CLINICAL PASTORAL EDUCATION):	
Charismatics and	113, 35
RACE (see BLACK MUSLIM: HISPANIC: HUMAN	
RELATIONS)	
RELEVANCE:	
A cop-out	101, 44
RELIGION:	
Modes of Becoming	V1, N3, 35
Russian	120, 37
Views of Jefferson	V2, N1, 38
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION:	
Adult	132, 85
In Europe	125, 66
Pluralism and	132, 99
Religious Education	119, *al*
Small Groups and	102, 46
RELIGIOUS RESOURCE CENTER	125, 59
RESERVE (USAR) CHAPLAIN:	
Active Duty Training	108, 46
Mission and Functions	V1, N2, 59
	105, 29
	118, 37
Mobilization	124, 85
RETREAT HOUSE	125, 62
RETIREMENT:	
Emotional Needs	126, 35

Ministry to Retired 115, 69
Reflections on 128, 115
Suddenly a Civilian 124, 95

SACRAMENTS:
Jesus in 113, 47

SOCIAL CONCERNS:
Alcoholism 112, *al*
Alienation and Identity V1, N4, 20
American Dream 111, 21
Community Problems V1, N4, 1
Domestic Crises 105, 58
Dying 109, *al*
Endorsing Agencies and V1, N4, 24
Homosexuality 122, 43
Meaning in Society 114, 39
Mission Strategy V1, N4, 33
Pluralism 102, 39
116, 27
Post Chaplains Perspective V1, N4, 47
Societal Trends 116, 7
Vital Issues V1, N4, 52

SPIRITUAL RENEWAL (see also CHARISMATICS)
Pastoral Instinct 128, 1
Spiritual Journeying 127, *al*
Study of Spirituality 128, 81
Temple Walking 114, 59

STRESS
Parental 130, 81

SYSTEMS (see ORGANIZATIONS and MANAGEMENT)

TEAM MINISTRY:
Energy for 125, 1
In Hospital 117, 53
In Military Community 117, 41
Peer Help 120, 75
Voluntarism in Care 114, 21

THEOLOGY:
And the Arts 121, *al*
Charismatic 113, 1
Can a Liberal Survive . . . 126, 21
Inferential 111, 29
Of Freedom 128, 17
Personal 111, 53
Transformation 132, 53

THEOLOGY OF MINISTRY
A Dialogical Story 130, 61
Three Images 132, 1

TOTAL INSTITUTION 132, 15

TRAINING:
Personal Effectiveness 120, 95
120, 107

Seven Echo 118, 89

US ARMY CHAPLAIN SCHOOL:
Advanced Course V1, N2, 43

VALUE EDUCATION:
Ethical Theory and 100, 17
History of V1, N2, 49
Human Self Development 107, 43
Officers and V2, N2, 30

WEST POINT:
Ministry at 118, 21

WOMEN (see HUMAN POTENTIAL):
Biblical Approach Toward 124, 37
Chaplains 128, 27
Exclusive Language in Hymnal 132, 73
Military Council of Catholic Women 125, 70
Pastors Wife 114, 95
Protestant Women of the Chapel 125, 73

WORSHIP (see also LITURGY: PREACHING: MUSIC):
Black V1, N1, 1
V1, N1, 51
V1, N2, 13
103, 18
104, 23
Christian Faith and 101, 32
Creative 122, 9
Dance in 121, 23
New forms in 128, 33
Participation in V1, N1, 19

YOUNG ADULT MINISTRY 129, *al*

YOUTH (see also CHILDREN):
Black V1, N1, 35
Leading retreats for 125, 7
Young Adults V1, N1, 51
119, 47
119, 95

Change of Address

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Old Address _____

_____

_____

Send to: Military Chaplains' Review
US Army Chaplain Board
Myer Hall, Bldg. 1207
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703

E. C. MEYER
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:

R.M. JOYCE
Major General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

Distribution:
Special

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 341-754/101